THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 9. DECEMBER, 1937. Vol. XXVII.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

English Modernists and their Prospects.

Dr. Gow commenting in the *Inquirer* (November 6th) on the Conference number of the *Modern Churchman* shews an insight into, and a sympathy with, the aims of Modern Churchmen not usually accorded to them by their opponents, whether Traditionalists, Secularists or Unitarians. He writes:

> 'That which lies behind these addresses is a firm faith in the power of a reformed Anglican Church to appeal to the religious nature of men and become again a vital influence making for purity of life, for social justice, for peace on earth and for a deeper reverence for God. They have no quarrel with the Non-conformist Churches, nay, they look upon them with warm sympathy as far as they try to teach the way of Christ, but they believe in the mission of the Church of England with its long history, its inherited prestige and its noble buildings to contribute something to the religious needs of to-day. They want to make it an effective and inspiring influence on the lives of men and women of all classes and creeds. They do not wish to drive out from the Church, those who find help in the sacraments or those who are satisfied with the creeds, but they affirm, surely with truth, that there are vast and increasing numbers of educated people to whom the sacraments are unreal and the creeds untrue and for whom the Church of England should still provide a home.'

Dr. Gow, we may add, regards the efforts of Modern Churchmen as doomed to failure since he is convinced that the authorities of the Church of England will never have the courage nor the insight to undertake or permit the dogmatic and liturgical reforms which Modernism demands if the nation, as a whole, is once again to find its spiritual home in the Church of England.

It may be that Dr. Gow is right. It was the prophet Isaiah who first taught the doctrine of the Remnant — that the Church-Nation, as a whole, could not be saved. As the mission of Jesus Christ advanced, it would seem that He also came to the same conclusion. Dean Inge has declared in our own generation that the narrow way will never be crowded. Yet there are many countervailing considerations, whether in the teaching of the prophets of Israel or in that of Jesus Christ Himself, which predict the triumph of the Kingdom of God in human society and are more in harmony with faith in a Creator of infinite wisdom and goodness.

In any case, whether Modern Churchmen are, or are not, doomed to failure they can have no doubt as to their duty to their Church and Nation in the present crisis. The Church of England may have her candlestick removed as has been the case with a great number of other Christian Churches in Africa, Asia and Europe; and if removed deservedly removed. But in that case we have no doubt that the Divine Kingdom will advance by other means — means which are loyal to the essentially Christian spirit of love, truth and freedom. In the history of the Christian Church we see the divine judgment manifested against ecclesiastical organizations which yielded to the temptation to advance themselves at the cost of sacrificing divine principles.

The organized Christian Church, whether it be the Church of England or the Church of Rome, stands or falls ultimately just in so far as it is loyal or disloyal to the Spirit of love, truth and freedom.

Roman Sectarianism in England.

The following incident (recorded in the *Times* of December 2nd) demands, even if it does not deserve, attention as indicating the schismatic and intolerant temper of Romanism in this country.

> 'Three months ago, in furtherance of the Archbishop of Canterbury's recall to Religion, Councillor Cecil Ferens, legal secretary to the Bishop of Durham, proposed that the monthly meetings of the Durham City Council should begin with prayer. The proposal was carried by a majority of three to one, and an attempt to rescind the motion at the next monthly meeting failed. Yesterday five Roman Catholic members of the council waited outside the council chamber

while the Dean of Durham (Dr. Alington), who is Chaplain to the Corporation, read prayers adapted from the Book of Common Prayer, and asked for God's blessing on the Mayor and Corporation of the city and all who dwell in it.'

In Tudor times a female Roman Catholic martyr in the north of England rejecting the prayers tendered by a Church of England clergyman, said: 'I will not say Amen to your prayers and you shall not say Amen to mine.'

We have never been able to understand what are the Christian principles upon which the Church of Rome acts. Why is it that the Duke of Norfolk, and, also we assume, a number of other Roman Catholic notables are permitted to take part in a Coronation service conducted by an English Primate. And yet the Councillors of the City of Durham are not permitted to be present when prayers are said at the opening of the meeting of the Council.

Roman Modernism in England.

We have received the following communication on the relations of Percy Gardner and Von Hügel from our Modernist Nestor, the Rev. Hubert Handley, and have much gratification in publishing it.

Those who loved and honoured Percy Gardner may, perhaps, be glad to learn, or to recall, two or three short appreciations of him by von Hügel; they are gathered and abbreviated from the Baron's *Selected Letters*.

Von Hügel writes on November 13th, 1902:

'I have been following, with true, warm interest and general sympathy, your works and endeavours in the religious field. I am thinking of your *Exploratio* which I find very stimulating reading; of your admirably simply and clearly, yet warmly and reverently thought and expressed *Historic View* and your review of James' *Varieties*.

'Will you let me tell you what are the three main circumstances and tendencies in you, that specially cheer and attract me?

'There is your general, critico-historical, severely cautious and careful method, and its practice and testing, through years of minutest classical, historical and archaeological labour; and yet your having required and effected a great addition and centre — the escape into an active and warm spiritual life, and a harmonization of these two sides— I care for this so much; and I, too, in my own degree and way, cannot live without both these sides.

'Then there is your Scotchness, and your close knowledge of and deep yet balanced love of German thought and work.

'And lastly, there is a touching, truly noble magnanimity of tone about all your work.

'The two points where I cannot follow are your somewhat Harnack-like apparent antagonism to a conception of Christianity as necessarily a manifold of constituents derived from previous Jewish, Persian, etc., sources, and touched to new life by the Founder.

'And my second point (of variance) — I feel it much less in you than in Harnack — is the not very profound "no metaphysics" tendencies.'

Von Hügel writes on March 14th, 1903:

'I would so much like to be allowed the pleasure and (as I feel it) the honour of proposing you as a member of our "Synthetic Society." If I may say so, you are so thorough and truthful, and so deeply religious and reverently free. We so badly want just your sort of mind (as Dr. Bigg, Dr. Bryce, Prof. Edward Dicey, Sir Richard Jebb are historical-minded also).

'I was profoundly refreshed by your denunciation of the merely rhetorical spirit, and by your delightfully first-hand account of the uniquely bracing effect upon the worker of all direct contact with fact.'

Some twenty years ago at a meeting of the London Society for the Study of Religion, Gardner read a paper on (if I remember rightly) the Life of Ruskin. At meetings of this Society the distinction of von Hügel's courtesy to readers and speakers taught always a beautiful lesson; but now his bearing toward Gardner had in it a touch of respect and, on the particular subject in hand, of deference which to Gardner's friends must have been very gratifying.

It is Roman Catholic laity of the Lord Acton and Baron von Hügel type, who in this country present us with an ideal of Catholicism in the fellowship of which English Churchmen and Roman Catholics can unite, on the higher levels, in intellectual moral and spiritual co-operation.

Courtenay Gale and Kenneth Saunders.

In our November issue we commemorated three notable English Modernists, Canon Streeter, Professor Percy Gardner and Canon Sheppard. English Modernism has suffered further losses by the decease of Canon Gale and Professor Kenneth Saunders. Their spheres of work lay far apart and were very different in their conditions, but both were united in their membership of the Modern Churchmen's Union and in their varied activities both were notable examples of its spirit and endeavour. We extract the following passage from the tribute to Canon Gale's memory published in the *Times* of November 11th:

The son of James Gale, electrician and inventor, he was born at Tavistock and educated privately and at St. John's College, Cambridge. He went to the new district of Christ Church, Sutton, a few years before the permanent church was built and the district consti-

tuted a parish in 1888. Partly through being a railway junction and having a good train service, Sutton was becoming a popular residential place for well-to-do people who had hitherto lived nearer to London. Gale soon gathered and held a congregation which few other men could have attracted. He himself was a loyal and enthusiastic supporter of the Church as established, but men came to Christ Church, many of them having been members of other bodies, because they were drawn by his vitality and eloquence and because they welcomed, not so much a church system, as a power which they felt to make for righteousness in the ordinary affairs of human life. What Gale had said in the pulpit was quoted and discussed in the train on Monday morning, and his utterances, if they did not settle all the questions tackled, always provoked thought. Large sums of money were raised for the building of the church, for the organ, tower, vicarage, and parish hall, one after the other, and Christ Church was generous to all good causes that commended themselves to the vicar. It was impossible to think of Gale apart from Christ Church, or of Christ Church without Gale, but his only other preferment was an honorary canonry of Southwark.

His versatility left us marvelling. He was an expert photographer and discussed improvements and inventions with leading photographic firms. He was something of an engineer . . . For some years he was well known in various Northern towns as a University Extension Lecturer. His course on the Lives of the Great Musicians was extraordinarily interesting and eloquent. He was proud of the high musical standard maintained at Christ Church, and himself composed a good deal of Church music. Some of his earlier compositions he himself condemned later on as sentimental and sugary. But, in listening to some of his later hymn tunes, one felt that they very nearly achieved greatness, which might perhaps be said of some other things that he did.

During the War he was chairman of the War Hospitals Supply Depôt and did much local War work as well as being a chaplain to the Territorials, and was as indefatigable and cheery as in everything that he took up. At clerical meetings or diocesan conferences he could be provocative, though always stimulating. If any opinions savoured of theological subtlety, or perhaps subterfuge, he cut in with ready, incisive common sense. But he had no enemies, and in the kind of neighbourhood in which rivalry between different churches is not impossible, he was entirely free from jealousy, and rejoiced in other men's successes.

He was suspect to some as a Modernist . . . Those who knew him will always associate his name with vigour, cheerfulness and kindness.

In the *Times* of November 22nd and 27th a double appreciation appeared of Kenneth Saunders.

Kenneth J. Saunders, D.Litt., was a sympathetic student of the religions of Asia, a teacher of philosophy, and a trained observer of the life and thought of faithful Buddhists throughout the Orient.

Educated at Clifton College and at Emmanuel College, Cambridge, of which university he subsequently received his D.Litt. degree, he devoted his life to the students of India, Ceylon, and Burmah. During the period from 1909-12, while engaged as a lecturer at Trinity College, Kandy, he was closely associated with the austere monks of the

Buddhist faith in Ceylon and gained his first insight into the religion of Gotama Buddha as a living faith. He was possessed of a growing conviction that Buddhism has been, not only the vehicle by which the heritage of India and Ceylon had been carried from their shores to other countries of Asia, but a most potent factor in their civilisation for the past two thousand years. At the same time he was conscious of a deepening sense of spiritual kinship between the followers of that great faith and Christianity.

From Ceylon he went to Burmah, where as student secretary of the Young Men's Christian Association with Burmese students he found further opportunities to penetrate the ramifications of Buddhist religious life and art. Then, at the outbreak of the Great War, he was the first Y.M.C.A. secretary to accompany the troops of the Indian regiments proceeding to France, where in practical and devoted service he ministered to the needs and comforts of these officers and men—Hindus, Mohammedans, Sikhs, Buddhists, and Christians—by inaugurating the work of the Indian Y.M.C.A. in huts specially provided for these loyal soldiers at the front, in the base camps and in hospitals.

After the War Saunders rendered valuable service in recruiting and training men for work in the Y.M.C.A. both at home and in the East. He then made further pilgrimages to the shrines and historic centres of Buddhism in other parts of Asia, chiefly in Japan and China. From 1921 to 1935 Dr. Saunders occupied the Chair of Comparative Religion at the School of Religions at Berkeley University, California. That experience, together with the literary and devotional merit of his prolific writings in prose and verse, led to the founding of the Spalding Chair at Oxford recently established for the purpose of promoting the study of comparative religions at that University. During the years 1935 and 1936 he lectured upon Asiatic history in several of the schools of Britain and worked for two terms in that capacity at Wellington.

His writings include many translations from the original Canons of the Buddhist Scriptures, and reveal his belief that the more Buddhism is studied the more does its affinity to the Christology of the Church stand revealed. Among his chief works were : *Buddhism, Adventures of the Christian Soul, Buddhist Ideals, Whither Asia, A Gospel for Asia, Gotama Buddha, The Heart of Buddhism, Ideals of East and West, Lotus's of the Mahayana, The Pageant of Asia,* and *Buddhism in the Modern World.*

In Dr. Kenneth Saunders there passes one of the few prophets of our age; a man whom the living truth irresistibly attracted, and who therefore in turn irresistibly attracted others. To him Buddhism was not a musty doctrine, but a way of life, a way that should make men of all creeds not ' cranks ' but better men. His books are a pageant of the spirit of the East, a mirror that reveals its life.

Himself a Christian, he held that Christianity has much to gain from the faiths of the East, and they from Christianity; each throws light upon the other. And in this spiritual drawing together he saw the solution of the greatest problem of the age; the relation between nations and civilizations, and especially between East and West. As he wrote in the most scholarly of his books, *Epochs in Buddhist History* : ' I would make a plea, not only for an attempt to understand one another, but for resolute co-operation in all idealistic enterprises. The enemies to-day are materialism and militarism; and Christianity

and Buddhism as it has developed in China and Japan . . . may humbly confess that each has received the truth as a free gift from the Father of Lights, who is indeed a wise physician of souls, and knows best how the truth may be revealed to each nation as to each individual.' Elsewhere he writes: 'A League of Religions against the common foe, materialism, would do much to reassure humanity and to serve the cause of the God of light and love.'

He made the School of Religions at Berkeley University, California, a centre of Buddhist study famous throughout the Far East. In English public schools he did a unique work. One who as a boy heard him at Winchester writes: 'When I was at Winchester he came down to speak to the upper forms on Eastern ways of thinking. He spoke on and on, and we were fascinated; then the headmaster gave him more time next morning, when he spoke for a good deal over an hour. He talked about the great Chinese and Japanese teachers, and all that he said was utterly new and strange to all of us. But the mysticism of the whole thing was enthralling, and his method of talking incredibly interesting to listen to. A Malvernian I was talking to said that he made just the same impression at Malvern.' At Wellington his methods were unconventional but equally impressive and appealing.

The English Church in Country Places.

The country parishes of England are receiving much attention at present from our church reformers. That is due to the great difficulty of securing incumbents for the poorer country parishes and to the desire, where the country parishes are rich, to deprive them of their surplus revenues. In the case of the poorer parishes the remedy usually prescribed is to unite them in groups of twos or threes under a single incumbent and to sell the unoccupied vicarage houses. The remedy in the case of the richer country parishes is to assign them to diocesan officials, rural deans, archdeacons, suffragan bishops, secretaries of diocesan organizations and church societies, so that the revenue of the parish can be utilized for diocesan as well as for parochial purposes. More drastic reformers desire to allocate the surplus revenues of the richer country parishes to industrial parishes possessing large populations but small resources. We would plead for tenderness in the treatment of country parishes bearing in mind two things:

(1) That every union of country parishes leads to a weakening of the Church in that locality, since although the parishes are united, the parishioners are not.

(2) That the population of England is steadily shifting today; particularly from the North to the South, and from the

large cities to outlying districts: so that country parishes possessed at present of small populations and large revenues may not seldom find themselves in the near future possessed of large populations and by no means excessive revenues.

What we believe to be much more serious than the money question in this connection is the decreasing popularity of the Church in many country parishes due to the attempt to 'catholicize' the parochial services and methods against the will of the parishioners. Prebendary Clayton in the *Record* of October 8th, 1937, gives a delightful picture of a group of country churches in the Hereford diocese, where things have remained unchanged, but where it would be hard for any liberally-minded Churchman (Modernist, Catholic or Evangelical) not to feel that it is altogether for the good that no changes have been made. St. Clodock is the chief of this group. Mr. Clayton thus describes the parish church and its service.

> 'On entering (and it is always open) the visitor will find himself back in the quiet times suggested by the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century. There is a gallery with a finely carved staircase; high pews; one of the best three-decker pulpits that the writer has ever seen (and it seems to require a preacher vested in gown and bands!); a communion table (uncovered), which is enclosed on three sides by rails in the style of the seventeenth century. The service is in harmony with the building. There is no surpliced choir; the prayers and responses are said, not intoned; the hymnal in use is "The Church Hymnal," and when the writer was there the praise included from that book the Scottish version of the 23rd Psalm and the paraphrase, "O God of Bethel," sung respectively to the delightful Scottish psalm tunes known as "Crimond" and "Stracathro."'

The celebration of the Holy Communion in the afternoon or evening in these rural parishes, as the only time possible for the attendance of many, secures good congregations. Canon Clayton concludes with some reflections deserving attention.

> 1. 'The Church in remote rural districts is by no means dead.
>
> 2. Though other schools of thought have their place within the Church of England, yet in many rural parishes there is a demand for a Protestant type of Anglican Churchmanship.
>
> 3. If those who have duties at home or on farms on Sunday are to communicate with a sense of leisure, Evening Communions are desirable . . .
>
> 4. To be an able minister of the Gospel in a small country parish is a harder task than to succeed as a minister of some favoured church in London or elsewhere, and deserves more praise than is usually received.'

TWO DANGEROUS MEASURES.

All who desire reasonable freedom for the Clergy combined with conscientious efficiency in the discharge of their duties, will scrutinize with some anxiety the two recent measures finally approved by the Church Assembly and about to be submitted to the Ecclesiastical Committee of Parliament and to the Law Officers of the Crown. These two measures are the *Cure of Souls Measure* and *Incumbents (Misbehaviour and Negligence) Measure*. It seems to us that if they should receive the sanction of the Crown in their present form, they will not only restrict the reasonable freedom of the clergy but also lead to the restriction of the Christian freedom of the English laity. We do not propose on this occasion to criticize these measures at length, but rather to call attention to their dangerous character and the serious need for amending them in some particulars. They might, unamended, be used to secure the clericalist domination of the Church. With the general intention of the two measures we have no quarrel. We all desire the efficiency of the clergy; and that clergymen, whose manners and methods are a scandal to their profession, should be deprived of their offices. What we do not like are some of the reasons for which it is proposed to deprive clergymen, and some of the methods to be used in such procedure. Three of the classes of misbehaviour under which a clergyman may be deprived are:

(1) Marriage during the life-time of a person to whom the incumbent has been previously married.

(2) Marriage to a person who has been previously married to a husband who is still living.

(3) Marriage to a person within the degrees prohibited by Canon ninety-nine of the Canons of 1603.

Why should a clergyman, who has been compelled to divorce his wife on account of adultery, be deprived of his Cure of Souls if he marries again during the life-time of his divorced wife?

Why should a clergyman who marries the innocent party in a divorce suit, be deprived of his Cure of Souls?

Why should a clergyman who marries his deceased wife's sister be deprived of his Cure of Souls?

In none of these cases has he broken the law of the land; in none of these cases has he done what a loyal layman may not do; in none of these cases will he cause scandal to the great body of his parishioners. It is contrary to the principles of English justice, and it is detrimental to the morality of the community, that there should be two standards of matrimonial morality—one for clergymen and another for laymen.

Another objection to these measures is the clericalist composition of the Court of first instance (the Diocesan Committee) which is to investigate charges made against an incumbent. The Court consists of six clergymen and the Promoter or Prosecutor is also a clergyman. Moreover, the defendant is permitted the assistance, not of Counsel, but of a clergyman. It seems to us that the Court of first instance should also consist of six parishioner's wardens—elected by the parishioner's wardens of the Diocese—also, that the defendant should have the right to be defended by Counsel, if he so desires.

We have cited these points to indicate the dangers to the Church which are threatened by this new legislation and to express the hope that the laity and Liberal clergy will make prompt and effective representations in the right quarter.

THE SECESSION OF SIR FRANCIS ACLAND, M.P.

The communication of Sir Francis Acland addressed to the Primate, declaring his intention of seceding from the Church of England and becoming a member of the Society of Friends on account of the official attitude of the Church to divorce and re-marriage, is significant of the cleavage between the lay mind and the ecclesiastical mind in this matter. Whilst the ecclesiastical mind is convinced of its loyalty to Christian principles in refusing the Church's solemnization of the marriage of any divorced person who has a former partner living, the lay mind deeply resents this policy. The lay mind views this policy as unjust because the ecclesiastical authorities by refusing to recognize a distinction between the innocent party and the guilty party in cases of divorce, seem by such refusal to incur the condemnation

of the Wise Man who wrote that: 'He that justifieth the wicked, and he that condemneth the just, are both alike an abomination to the Lord' (*Proverbs* xvii, 15).

The lay mind views this policy as unchristian because such action seems so hard and intolerant in contrast to the spirit of Jesus Christ in the Gospels as depicted in the story of the woman taken in adultery and other cases of sexual frailty. Obedience to the Christian religion seems to the lay mind to mean obedience to the Spirit of Christ, and loyalty to the principles of His teaching — not servitude to the letter of the Scripture interpreted and applied in a hard and narrow fashion. The hard literalism of the ecclesiastical mind seems always ready to make logic and not experience the test of policy. It was this which led the great Lord Clarendon, who did all in his power to rescue the Church of England from the rigour and the ruin of the Laudian policy to declare that of all classes of educated men the clergy were the worst judges of public affairs.

It is becoming steadily clearer that if the Church of England to-day is to be delivered from dissolution, it must, in its policy, pay far more attention to the sympathies and convictions of the English laity and not least to the disgruntled laity: the vast majority of whom express their dissatisfaction, not by public protest as Sir Francis Acland has conscientiously done, but by the easier method of silent withdrawal.

An Open Bible and a Progressive Reformation.

The following letter to the *Times* of November 27th, signed by the Bishop of Worcester, the Master of St. Peter's Hall, Oxford, and a number of prominent Free Churchmen, stresses the debt which Evangelical Christians believe themselves to owe to the Reformation.

> Few of your readers can fail to have been stirred by the Bishop of Manchester's announcement in your columns of the proposed celebration next year of the 400th anniversary of the royal injunction to set up in parish churches a copy of the English Bible — 'our greatest national heritage.'
>
> As the Bishop's letter indicates, such a commemoration also affords the right basis for reminding ourselves of the significance and importance of the Reformation — that long spiritual movement which was at once the giver and the gift of the English Bible: the two are inseparable.

The following four causes for special thanksgiving will be found helpful in connexion with the systematic teaching, urged by the Bishop, preparatory to the Day of Commemoration on Sunday, June 19th, 1938. Their presentation was one of the steps approved of by that representative meeting in May, 1935, at which the Archbishop of Canterbury and Dr. Scott Lidgett spoke, and the celebration of 'The Fourth Centenary of the Reformation and the English Bible' was launched.

(1) The Reformation has given to every English man, woman, and child, free access to the Bible in their own tongue as the supreme rule and standard for faith, life, and devotion.

(2) The Reformation reasserted the Gospel of salvation by the free grace of God through faith in Christ, and of the direct personal access of the believer to God through Christ.

(3) The Reformation, by its appeal to the Scriptures, led to the recognition of more spiritual conceptions of the Church and Sacraments, to the purification of worship, and to renewed emphasis on the ministry of the Word.

(4) The Reformation, by its emphasis on the spiritual liberty of the children of God, proclaimed in Holy Scripture, has been the fruitful seed of true liberty in all departments of thought and life.

This is not a complete account of the debt due to the English Reformation, although those who think of the Reformation as finished in the Tudor period may be led to such a conclusion. The Reformation gave to the English people, not only the open Bible but also a hardly less important gift, the open mind or the right of private judgment in religious matters—a private judgment which should seek, not only the guidance of the Holy Spirit, but also enlightenment from all advances in human knowledge.

For Liberals or Modernists the Reformation is still in progress and by no means completed. What we owe to the Reformation in this age in the sphere of a truer understanding of the Bible is well-expressed in the following letter sent to us by the Hon. and Rev. James Adderley—a stalwart of the Modern Churchmen's Union.

'I think it should be made more clear that Liberal Christians can take part *ex animo* in the Bible celebrations, though possibly for somewhat different reasons than those put forward by others. It is exactly an "Open Bible" that Liberals clamour for and have largely obtained during the past centuries. We can nowadays without irreverence treat the Bible like any other book. It would be a bad day for the Church if it were ever said that Churchmen are afraid of the Truth. The Bible is now in a real sense "open." We have been led to a view of Inspiration which saves us from being obscurantist. We are able fearlessly to criticize the books knowing that if they are from God the truth about

their authorship and structure can never lead us wrong. We may prefer to say that the Bible contains the Word of God rather than that it is the Word of God, but that does not minimize our thankfulness that it is open to all. Speaking for myself I can but say that it is the liberal view of the Bible that has made real to me (to take two instances out of many) the meaning of prophecy and also the true humanity of our Lord.'

In the forthcoming 400th Anniversary celebration we hope that every effort will be made to bring home to English people generally the need for a truer understanding of the Bible achieved for us by the courageous, patient and reverent labours of our great modern Bible critics. English Christianity has lost much ground during the last eighty years by its attitude towards Biblical Criticism. During the first half of that period the Church's attitude was one of opposition; during the second half it has been one of timidity in applying those results in the spheres of dogma and worship.

THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES

A CASE FOR RETENTION AND REVISION

By the Right Reverend H. H. Henson, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of Durham.

I.

THE disruption of the Western Church in the sixteenth century drew in its train the production of a number of theological statements or confessions advanced by the leaders of the fragments, national and denominational, into which the once united Church had been broken. The crisis had raised some formidable questions. Did disruption involve heresy? Did the loss of the old unity of system bring with it necessarily a state of ecclesiastical anarchy? How far did the traditional Christian morality share the fate which had befallen the traditional Christian doctrine? These questions pressed for answer. There was thus a twofold necessity under which the historic Confessions were framed. On the one hand, the revolting sections had to justify their revolt: on the other hand, they had to provide a basis for their own independent organization. Why had they broken away from the immemorial dominion of the Popes? How would they take shape as separated Churches? The times

were revolutionary. Grave excesses, doctrinal and moral, marked the course of the Reformation, and damaged its credit. It was plainly requisite for the Reformed Churches to clear themselves of any connection with such deplorable developments. The Confessions, therefore, were both *apologetic and disciplinary*. They set forward in the face of Christendom the various 'platforms' on which their systems were builded. The Unreformed Church, since it also had become but a fragment of the Western Church, albeit in extent the largest, lay under the same compulsion. It too had to accept the necessity of Reformation. The sixteenth century, which witnessed the constitution of the Reformed Churches, witnessed also the reconstitution of the Church of Rome. Within much restricted limits the medieval tradition persisted in a revised version. The Reformation evoked and largely determined the Counter-Reformation. In the canons and decrees of the Council of Trent the Church of Rome offered its own apology, and provided for its own discipline.

Between A.D. 1530, when the Lutherans presented their famous Confession to the Imperial Diet at Augsberg, to 1571, when the Elizabethan Parliament imposed the Thirty-nine Articles on the English Clergy, a succession of doctrinal statements was issued — Lutheran, Reformed, Anglican, and Roman. Political rather than religious cases explain the curious fact that the famous formulary of the Church of Scotland bears an English name, the Westminster Confessions, and was not framed until the seventeenth century. All these documents had the same character, and served the same purpose. They set forth to the world the 'platform' of the Church which accepted them, and declared the conditions of its membership.

In a divided Christendom there is evident need that every independent fraction shall justify its independence, and make plain the conditions of its fellowship. So long as Christendom remains divided, the need for such official confessions will continue. Every Church claiming to be autonomous must declare its 'platform' as well doctrinal as disciplinary. Only those who can honestly accept that 'platform' can rightly be commissioned to hold office within the Church.

II.

Every clergyman of the Church of England at his Ordination, and when he is admitted to office, whether as a stipendiary curate or as an incumbent, is legally required to declare his 'assent' to the Thirty-nine Articles. The actual formula was provided by the Clerical Subscription Act of A.D. 1865, which was passed in consequence of the strong and long-continued agitation in which Dean Stanley had been a protagonist. It replaced the older and more stringent formula prescribed by the Caroline Act of Uniformity.

The Dean of Exeter, in his excellent volume, '*Church and State* 1789-1889,' has stated the facts thus:

> 'Whereas up to 1865 they (sc. the clergy) had been required, in a complicated way which involved a number of "vain repetitions," "willingly and *ex animo* to subscribe to the Thirty-nine Articles and to all things therein contained," a clergyman after the Clerical Subscription Act of 1865 was only called upon to make the following declaration: "I, A.B., assent to the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, and to the Book of Common Prayer, and of Ordering of Bishops, Priests and Deacons; I believe the doctrine of the Church of England, as therein set forth, to be agreeable to the Word of God: and in public prayer and administration of the Sacraments I will use the form in the said book provided, and none other, except so far as shall be ordered by lawful authority." It was intended that this should represent a general assent, not a detailed adherence to the hundreds of statements, many of them expressed in the peculiar and now out-worn terminology of the sixteenth century contained in the Articles. The new form required an alteration in Canon 36. In spite of some petitions from outside, Convocation with practical unanimity made the change, and the revised Canon, having obtained the Royal Assent, was promulgated and became the law of the Church.'[1]

The full significance of the change effected by the Clerical Subscription Act of 1865 is not easily perceived apart from a knowledge of the agitation for relief which preceded the action of Parliament. When that history has been fairly considered, it will become evident that Subscription as now framed is designed to require no more from the English Clergyman than what is properly implicit in his Christian profession, and indispensable if he is to exercise a ministry in the Church of England.

[1] p. 350.

III.

The value of subscription, and even its morality, have been, from time to time, hotly debated; and, when both have been allowed, the fitness of the Thirty-nine Articles for their presumed purpose has been challenged. What, it has been asked, is really implied in declaring assent to the Thirty-nine Articles? If they be no more than 'Articles of Peace,' and do not possess the character of declarations of individual belief, what is their practical utility? Do they really express the mind of the Church of England? If it must be admitted that they are in important measure obsolete, who can be trusted to determine where the line is to be drawn between the Articles which may fairly be pressed as fully authoritative, and those which may be legitimately ignored? These questions have been agitated from the first. The Puritans and Laudians raised them in the seventeenth century, the Deists in the eighteenth, the Tractarians and 'Broad Churchmen' in the nineteenth, the 'Anglo-Catholics' and the 'Modernists' in the twentieth. At the present time the Articles are being openly ignored in the discussions of re-union with the Eastern Churches, and steadily belittled by the missionaries. They are however still in the forefront of the English clergyman's obligation when he is ordained, licensed, and instituted; and every incumbent is required to read them publicly to the congregation before he is legally qualified to hold his benefice. All this emphasis only serves to throw into more arresting prominence the dislike and disregard into which the famous Confession has fallen.

It will not then be thought superfluous if we devote this essay to considering what the obligation implicit in the legally required 'assent' to the Thirty-nine Articles may reasonably be thought to be. If it be the case that these Articles are partly obsolete, partly misleading, and partly even false, it must needs follow that the assent which the modern clergyman is able to give to them is not unconditioned. The Thirty-nine Articles of 1563 were substantially a re-issue of the Forty-two Articles of 1553. Some measure of obsoleteness is inevitable in a document of the sixteenth century which is made to do duty in the twentieth. In that interval of nearly four centuries many changes

have taken place. Human life never continues in one stay. The intellectual equipment and outlook of Archbishop Cranmer and his contemporaries were not the same as ours now are. Their moral standards were hardly less divergent. It is sufficient to remember that the astronomical doctrine of Copernicus had not yet gained acceptance, and that the best Christians judged doctrinal error to be deserving of death. When, indeed, the contrast between thought and life in the sixteenth century and in the twentieth is fairly allowed for, it is not the obsoleteness of so ancient a formulary, but the comparatively small extent of the obsoleteness, that moves astonishment. The politic wisdom of the Tudor statesmen mitigated the dogmatic ardour of the Tudor divines. Queen Elizabeth was more concerned for civic harmony than for theological orthodoxy. Fuller, writing in the next century, gave a true account of the conditions under which the Anglican Articles were finally shaped :

> 'Children's clothes ought to be made of the biggest, because afterwards their bodies will grow up to the garments. Thus the articles of the English Protestant Church, in the infancy thereof, they thought good to draw up in general terms, foreseeing that posterity would grow up to fill the same; I mean these holy men did prudently prediscover that differences in judgments would unavoidably happen in the Church, and were loath to unchurch any, and drive them off from an ecclesiastical communion for such petty differences; which made them pen the articles in comprehensive words, to take in all who, differing in the branches, meet in the root of the same religion.'[2]

It is surely excessive to describe the Thirty-nine Articles 'as an instance of a set of formulae which history has discredited.'[3] The precise opposite would be more nearly true. History has certified the remarkable success of the Articles, and offered liberal praise for their breadth and tolerance. Dixon, who was certainly not disposed to magnify the work of the English reformers, is representative of many historians when he writes admiringly of the Articles. Of the original Forty-two he says that they 'shewed a suprisingly comprehensive and moderate spirit.' '*The broad touch of Cranmer* lay upon them,' and the effect of that touch was strengthened by Cranmer's like-minded successor, Parker, under whom the Edwardian formulary was revised

[2] *Church History of Britain*, Bk. ix. s. 52.

[3] *The Church in the Twentieth Century*, p. 325.

and imposed;

> 'Regarded whether as a symbol or a code,' writes Dixon, 'the English Articles, which had passed thus successively through the hands of Cranmer and Parker can scarcely fail to move admiration in comparison with the similar performances of the age.'[4]

The Thirty-nine Articles served well the purpose with which they were originally imposed. They enabled men of widely divergent opinions to accept office in the National Church, and they made possible the development of that liberal version of Christianity which has been historically distinctive of Anglicanism. But they could not escape from the disadvantage of their close relation to the controversies of the age. As these gave place to new conflicts, the Articles tended to fall out of accord with Anglican feeling. The seventeenth century was not as the sixteenth. Theological controversies were largely replaced by ecclesiastical. The Church of England drew away from the fellowship of the continental Protestants, and developed claims of its own, which they could with difficulty understand, and could in no circumstances admit. 'The Thirty-nine Articles,' observes Principal Tulloch, 'cannot be taken as a characteristic specimen of Anglo-Catholic theology.'

> 'They were framed before the emergence of its distinctive dogmatic spirit, and have indeed constituted a main difficulty to the most pronounced adherents of the school, who have sought by various glosses to harmonise them with Catholic doctrine. But, such as they are, they exhibit a marked difference to the full-grown type of Puritan theology, as presented, for example, in the canons of the Synod of Dort, or the chapters of the Westminster Confession of Faith. In the one there is present everywhere a touch of moderation, the softening influence of a conciliatory doctrinism which is true to the positive aspects of Augustinianism and the evangelical import of the great questions raised by the Reformation, but which yet shrinks, for the most part, from all negative and extreme deductions. Their meaning is Calvinian; but the logic of Calvinism is sparingly used, and a dogmatic Scripturism does not obtrude itself. In the other, all generality and Scripture manifoldness have disappeared.'[5]

This is a just and discriminating statement by an eminent Presbyterian divine. Puritanism discovered its inherent incompatibility with such a version of Christianity as the Tudors bequeathed to their successors, and finally broke with the Church which it had vainly striven to dominate. Laud was the decisive

[4] *History of the Church of England*, v. 395.

[5] *Rational Theology in England in the Seventeenth Century*, Vol. I, p. 65.

figure of the religious crisis. His clear perception of the practical problem, his self-dedication to the cause of rescuing the National Church from Puritan control, his personal sincerity, his reckless courage, his political unwisdom, his personal tactlessness and unpopularity, combined to secure a victory which, if it saved Anglicanism, did so at the cost of finally destroying the religious unity of the Nation. Laud's hostility to the Puritans gave a measure of plausibility to the suggestion of his enemies that he inclinded in his heart towards a reconciliation with Rome. In 1634 there appeared a book on the Articles which anticipated the exegetic method of Tract XC. It was written by a convert from Anglicanism to Rome, Christopher Davenport (1598-1680), better known as Franciscus a Sancta Clara, and it was designed to promote a reconciliation with Rome. It was dedicated to Charles I., and 'if not licensed in England, was probably tolerated by the Archbishop.' Its appearance tended to confirm the general suspicion with which the Archbishop was regarded, and it entered into the case for his impeachment. Of it, as later of Tract XC, it may be truly said that it was less a serious effort to explain the Articles than an adroit attempt to explain them away. For it is certain that the Thirty-nine Articles constitute a Protestant confession, and, as such, was rightly included in the 'Harmony Confessions' published at Geneva in 1581, and referred to in the XXth Canon of 1604.

> 'With all their halting betwen two opinions, their want of theological originality, their intentional incompleteness, they have been a noble bulwark of Protestant conviction, and possess a simple dignity and catholicity of their own. Against their measured testimony, spoken with the formula of Trent as clearly in view as those of Lutheranism and Calvinism, even the interpretative casuistry and antiquarian imagination of the Oxford Movement urged their forces in vain.'[6]

This is the verdict of a scholarly Presbyterian, and it is true, but not the whole truth. For the Articles have never stood alone, as a summary of Anglican Christianity. They have always been received by English Churchmen together with the other Anglican standards, the Prayer Book and the Ordinal, which express a version of Christianity far removed from the fears and feuds of the Reformation. Moreover, the development of the Nation's

[6] Professor Curtis, Article 'Confessions' in Hastings *Encylopedia of Religion and Ethics*.

Religion has been potently influenced by the course of the Nation's history. The normal isolation of the island Church was intensified by the course of European politics. Religion had little concern with the causes which led England to take part in continental wars through the century which connects the Treaty of Utrecht in 1713 with the Treaty of Paris in 1815. Churches no longer call the tune for statesmen. In modern Europe dynastic and economic interests rarely coincide with ecclesiastical profession. Thus the Church of England fell apart almost unconsciously from the fellowship of the continental Protestants with whom the English Reformers have been in such close and affectionate relation. Anglicanism developed on lines of its own, and these have carried it far from the normal Protestant type. In effect, the Protestant character which at first commended the Articles to general acceptance has become in process of time the reason for their unpopularity. Older and more fundamental elements of Anglican Christianity have been free to develop without the arresting influence of religious panic, or the coercive direction of public policy.

Mr. Gladstone, writing to a Greek Archbishop in 1875, gave a fair statement of the facts :

> 'In a practical point of view, the Prayer-Book represents the Catholic and historic aspect of the Church of England, the Articles the particular phase brought out by the events of the sixteenth century. I speak of both in the main: for some of the most Catholic declarations are in the Articles, and one or two of the most Protestant are in the Prayer-Book. Lord Chatham said the Liturgy, or Prayer-Book, was Popish, the Articles Calvinistic. No doubt their colour is distinct, but I do not think that, rationally and comprehensively understood, they are in contradiction. Our divines would say generally that they integrate one another, but would assign the greater moral weight in importance to the Prayer-Book'[7]

When the Thirty-nine Articles are presented for the subscription of modern clergymen they have an aspect of archaic irrelevance which may explain and even in some measure justify desire to get rid of them altogether. Before, however, yielding to this natural feeling, it may be well to consider somewhat more carefully the service which the Articles may still render to the English Church.

[7] *Correspondence on Church and Religion*, selected and arranged by D. C. Lathbury, Vol. II. p. 67.

IV.

Alike for negotiations with other branches of the Church, as for the instruction of its own members, *some* authoritative statement of specifically Anglican teaching and practice is really indispensable. Such an authoritative statement is provided by the Thirty-nine Articles, and, if they were abandoned, it would be necessary to provide a substitute. Of course, if it should come to be thought that the distinctive features of Anglicanism were not worth maintaining, and that, in the interest of ecclesiastical unity, they ought to be discarded, the retention of the Thirty-nine Articles as an official standard of the Church of England could not be justified, for the Church of England would itself in any recognizable shape have ceased to exist. Such a view is little likely to commend itself to any informed and considering Anglican. The issues at stake are seen to be such as pertain to the fundamentals of religious principle, not to the contingencies of ecclesiastical order. The factors which in the sixteenth century compelled the breach with the Papacy have not lost validity in process of time. The remarkable development of historical science has not disallowed the original Anglican verdicts. Experience, continued through four centuries, has nowise inclined English Churchmen to reverse the decisions which the Reformers reached, and which determined the lines on which the Church of England has developed. In face of the actual situation which confronts modern Christians, and the unceasing propagation of opinions destructive of liberty and law, can it be reasonably thought to be superfluous that formal and public affirmation should be made of such Anglican essentials as those which the Thirty-nine Articles include — that the Rule of Faith is Scripture only (Article VI.); that neither Creeds (Article VIII.) nor ecclesiastical decisions (Article XX.) may be pleaded against Scripture; that General Councils are not infallible (Article XXI.); that ecclesiastical traditions may vary and be changed by 'particular or national' churches (Article XXXIV.); that the Laity are entitled to communicate in both kinds (Article XXX.); that the clergy are free to marry (Article XXXII.); that military service for just cause is part of the Christian citizen's duty (Article XXXVII.); that private pro-

perty is not inconsistent with the Christian profession (Article XXXIX.)? All these constituents of historic Anglicanism are matters of principle, not of expediency; they go to the roots of Christian faith and morals; they could not be surrendered by English Churchmen without disloyalty to essential truth. But, we must add, all are heavily challenged in the modern world. All therefore ought to be kept steadily in the forefront of Anglican witness. We have spoken of them as 'Anglican essentials,' and such has come to be their character; but none of them is in itself specifically Anglican. Every one is integral to a conception of Christian faith and duty which may rightly claim acceptance from Christians as such.

V.

We have already referred to the prevailing discontent with the Thirty-nine Articles, which threatens to drive them into total neglect. That, we must needs think, would be on many grounds regrettable. Some Anglican Confession is clearly indispensable. The only Confession we possess is gravely unsatisfactory. The Thirty-nine Articles imperatively need a revision which would remove from them whatever can be fairly shown to be superfluous, inaccurate, and obsolete, and retain only what is important and demonstrably true. The unabridged formula might well take its place with the initial Prefaces in the Prayer-Book as an historic document illustrating the English Reformation, while only its essential content was subscribed by the clergy and read aloud in the parish churches where they are set to minister.

So long as the Christian Society is divided on issues so fundamental as to transcend even the interest of visible unity, separate Churches must exist, and must show cause for doing so. It would be manifestly intolerable that men should be authorized to minister as officers and teachers who did not assent to the doctrine and discipline of the Church which they officially represented. It would be not less intolerable if the parishioners were to possess no security against mere individualism on the part of the clergy. Therefore subscription is really indispensable, as well for the protection of the people, as for the security of the Church. The Thirty-nine Articles, abbreviated, corrected, and largely recast, would provide what is needed.

RELIGIOUS REALISM IN AMERICA

By the Rev. Randolph Crump Miller, Ph.D.,
Church Divinity School of the Pacific, Berkeley, California, U.S.A.

AMONG the more modern religious thinkers in America, has been a new movement which has been well named 'Religious Realism.' Professor Henry Nelson Wieman tells us that realism may be classified under four headings.[1] Metaphysically, it is the belief that events, things, and forms exist independently of God; they are the materials through which and with which God works. Epistemologically, the realists believe that the object of experience exists independently of its being experienced, and of its being known by a mind. In the third place, evil is recognized as a definite fact to be considered. The fourth emphasis of realism is on the urgent need for immediate action. Realism is predominantly practical.

There are several authoritative statements of *Religious Realism* which may be quoted to make the issue clear. Professor Douglas Clyde Macintosh of Yale tells us that

> 'Religious realism . . . means centrally the view that a religious Object, such as may appropriately be called God, exists independently of our consciousness thereof, and is yet related to us in such a way that *through reflection on experience in general and religious experience in particular, and without any dependence upon the familiar arguments of epistemological idealism, it is possible for us to gain either . . . adequately verified knowledge or . . . a practically valuable and theoretically permissible faith* not only that the religious Object exists but also, within whatever limits, as to what its nature is.'[2]

Theology, in other words, must turn to the methods of empirical philosophy and experimental science in order to establish the existence and nature of God.

The movement of religious realism is an outgrowth of post-war liberalism. It is a new temper in modern thought. Some of the realists have disavowed the term 'liberalism' altogether; but they have merely applied the method of liberalism in a more vigorous and rigorous fashion. Religious realism is an attitude which expresses the desire to treat religious 'facts'—such as

[1] *Christendom.* Chicago; 1: 199.
[2] *Religious Realism.* Edited by D. C. Macintosh. (Macmillan.) *p.v.* Italics mine.

God, values, evil, persons, and the world — as objective. It is a method which seeks truth, wherever it may be found, by the means of techniques which are analagous to the scientific method. It is primarily empirical, although it accepts concepts which cannot be empirically verified, provided the additional concepts are logically consistent with the empirical data. This movement believes in

> 'a resolute determination to face all the facts of life candidly, beginning preferably with the most stubborn, perplexing, and disheartening ones . . . and then *through* these stubborn facts and not *in spite* of them, to pierce as deep as one may into the solid structure of objective reality, until one finds whatever ground of courage, hope, and faith is *actually* there, independent of human preference and desires, and so casts anchor in that ground.' [3]

It is necessary that theology should be freed from the shackles of wishful-thinking and illusion. As Professor Wieman tells us,

> 'Most religion most of the time, both within Christendom and without, has blinded men to facts, has magnified illusion, and has hindered man from making adaptation to things as they are. . . . There is a religion which seeks for facts at all costs. It insists that facts are far more important than any cherished mistaken beliefs, no matter how unpleasant the facts and how delightful the beliefs. . . . God is a fact, and this world is made up of facts; and if we are ever to live securely and magnificently in this world (or any other) it can only be through adaptation to these facts.' [4]

This, then, is the spirit of 'Religious Realism.' It is the spirit of modern science applied to the greatest and most complex *Fact* of all: the object of direct religious experience. At present, the data are still confused. We are just beginning to develop the techniques whereby experimental religion can give us verified concepts of God. Henry Nelson Wieman, Walter Marshall Horton, and Douglas Clyde Macintosh are three of the acknowledged leaders of the movement.

Henry Nelson Wieman and Experimental Religion.

Professor Wieman, more than any other theologian, has succeeded in putting the questions and answers of religious philosophy into scientific terms. He has succeeded in making real contributions to the concepts of religious living.

Wieman's theory of knowledge is based upon the instrument-

[3] Walter Marshall Horton, *Realistic Theology*. (Harper.) p. 38.
[4] Henry Nelson Wieman, *The Wrestle of Religion with Truth*. (Macmillan.) pp. 1, 3.

alism of John Dewey[5] and the radical empiricism of William James. In most of his interpretations of religious behaviour he has borrowed from the theories of the behaviouristic psychologists (without, however, denying the freedom of the will). Immediate experience is an important element in the obtaining of knowledge, but it gives only *data*. It does not, in itself, yield knowledge. Religious knowledge, as well as secular knowledge, has no mysterious element. We begin with immediate experience, and

> 'we know an object when we are able to designate certain sense qualities having a certain order in time and space. When we experience one or more of these sense qualities in certain temporal and spatial relations to other sense qualities, we are able to infer that the object before us is of a certain sort, a table or chair or what not. We test this inference by exposing ourselves to further sense qualities. If these further sense qualities are of the sort that properly pertain to the inferred object occurring in that order in space and time which is proper to the object in question, we know that our inference was correct. Our knowledge is then fairly certain. All the elaborate tests of scientific investigation depend ultimately upon this corroboration of inference by means of sense data.'[6]

There are two kinds of knowledge, which may be designated as knowledge of acquaintance and knowledge of description. The former deals with experienced or experienceable (and verifiable) objects. The latter deals with what in the nature of the case can never be experienced. Only in knowledge by acquaintance can we refer to the *data* of experience, and therefore obtain verifiable knowledge. Our knowledge of God is that of acquaintance. God is an object of immediate experience, and our concept of God is true or untrue in so far as it fits the facts of human experience. Religious experience is as real as any other experience; and the object of religious experience is just as real as the object of any other experience. God, as the object of that experience, to that extent does exist. It then remains for us to analyze the *data* of that experience, and by a method analogous to that of experimental science to determine what concept of God is most suited to the available facts.

[5] 'An appreciation of the thought and work of John Dewey has been growing on me. I am no pragmatist, and I am sure the thought of John Dewey is no stopping place. He himself would insist on that.' *Contemporary American Theology*, edited by Vergilius Ferm. (Round Table.) Vol. I, p. 345.

[6] *Religious Experience and Scientific Method.* (Macmillan.) p. 25.

Most scientific thinking is based upon careful selection and the limiting of awareness. The carefully trained scientific mind selects its data from the manifold of experience, and by experimentation succeeds in making it fit a certain theory; or it constantly revamps its theory until some degree of verification is reached. But in the realm of discovery, or of genius of any sort, it is the breaking of the bonds of tradition, the widening of the sense of awareness, which is the cause. The genius, whether in science, in art, or in religion, is one who takes

> 'note of that which lies about, but which we have not been taught to observe by the established theories of science nor by traditional common sense.' [7]

It is this increased awareness, sometimes called intuition, which is the beginning of new knowledge; but while it may lead to greater insight, it is also prone to error; and it is only through reflection and experimentation that we may come to see that it is (to some extent at least) true.[8]

In the analysis of the religious experience, Wieman turns to William James for help. James' theory of the Subliminal[9] maintains that there are 'other forms of consciousness' different from 'our rational consciousness.' James believed that these other forms were 'discontinuous' with normal consciousness. But, says Wieman,

> 'they are not discontinuous. They are directly continuous. . . . The only difference between them and normal consciousness is that in them we become aware of a mass of merged data, so merged as to be a single, unanalyzed, and unsifted datum, while in ordinary experience we are aware only of a very few data which have been selected from out of this flood. . . . They are simply states in which our awareness is more diffusive, less selective and analytic.' [10]

It is in this manner that mysticism is described. There is an undefined awareness and there is emotion, upon which the awareness works; and usually there are *distinct symbols which are carried into the experience* in order to insure its efficacy. Furthermore, this awareness of undifferentiated experience, when unconnected with the emotions and symbols, is vague and

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 191. Cf. *Normative Psychology of Religion.* (Crowell.) p. 242.
[8] *Ibid.*, p. 195. Cf. also Horton, *Theism and the Scientific Spirit*, pp. 177 *ff.*
[9] Cf. James, *Varieties of Religious Experience*, p. 242.
[10] *Religious Experience*, etc., pp. 320-321. Cf. *Normative Psychology of Religion*, pp. 173-191.

fluctuating. And

> 'most important of all, *there is no well-defined concept of that which is experienced, and hence no means of clearly thinking or cognizing the object ingredient in the total even experienced.*'[11]

The aroused emotions may be turned to good or evil. The result may be either misguided error or deliberate misdeed. But the usual prerequisite for such experience includes the good-will, and those who seek this power seek something good. But the emotions are by-products.

> 'The significant thing in religious experience is that object which produces such a response.'[12]

We experience something which is not ourselves, which we call God.

This, in brief, is the position of Wieman concerning religious knowledge and religious experience. It is admittedly a *minimum* position, in which all things are reduced to the barest facts. It remains to ask what sort of a God is actually to be verified by such experimental methods. We are not dealing with reasonable faith and traditional belief, which, as we shall see, Horton and Macintosh allow to enter into the problem; we are dealing only with a concept of God which can be verified by scientific methods of experimentation.

Theocentric religion has two requirements, which are obvious in the light of the above account. First, we must 'make the actuality of God himself, and not our ideas about God, the object of our love and devotion.' Secondly, we must 'not allow our wishes and needs to shape our idea of God, but (must) shape it solely in the light of objective evidence.'[13] Both Horton and Macintosh would agree with this, but the opinions on what constitutes evidence vary. Weiman writes:

> 'God is superhuman, but not supernatural. He is a present, potent, operative, observable entity. . . . He is more worthy of love than any other beloved. Furthermore, human beings do love him more passionately than any other when they are sensitivized to him and appreciate him. He is one to whom men and women can pray and who answers prayer. He brings human life to highest fulfilment when men commit themselves to him; and destruction waits on human life when men do not. . . . *God is that interaction between individuals, groups and ages*

[11] *Religious Experience*, etc., pp. 207-208. Italics mine.
[12] *Ibid.*, p. 208.
[13] *Contemporary American Theology*, Vol. I, ed. by Vergilius Ferm, p. 346.

which generates and promotes the greatest possible mutuality of good. . . . God, like everything else in existence, is a *process* having a definite *pattern. . . .* God in his absolute nature reaches down to the depths of existence, and up to the sublimest heights of possibility, and includes, somewhere between these two extremes, that interaction between individuals, groups and ages which makes for the greatest sharing of experience.' [14]

God is the Supreme Value. This supreme value cannot be the universe as a whole. It is not merely the ideal concept of the universe. It is

'that activity . . . which shapes life toward that progressive attainment of mutual support and meaning.' [15]

The supreme value is

'the growth of meaning in the world. . . . Growth is not even to be identified with progress, if progress means the movement of the whole universe onward and upward towards greater value. Growth simply means that in some quarter or other there is a development by which the connections of mutual support and mutual meaning are extended and made closer. . . . *This growth of meaning and value in the world is God.*' [16]

Perhaps this vocabulary is confusing. To refer to God as an 'interaction,' a 'pattern,' a 'process,' or a 'growth' is far from the language of traditional theology. But we must remember that Wieman is speaking the language of modern psychology, and all persons are processes and patterns, and the relations between them are interactions. God is more than a sum-total of the interactions of persons working towards the good. God is a metaphysical process, and is working in and through nature, independently of man. God is a *power*, although not the only power. God is the growth of meaning and value in a pluralistic universe; and this pluralism eliminates the problem of evil. In many ways this concept of God is similar to Whitehead's 'principle of concretion,' which brings all things into the totality of being.[17]

God includes both existence and possibility. He is the

'order of existence and possibility, by virtue of which the greatest possible good is truly a possibility and can be achieved by human effort.' [18]

[14] *Is there a God?* By H. N. Wieman, D. C. Macintosh, and M. C. Otto. (Willett, Clark.) pp. 11, 13, 14. Italics mine.
[15] *American Philosophies of Religion.* (Willett, Clark.) p. 299.
[16] *Normative Psychology in Religion*, p. 51. Italics mine.
[17] Cf. *Wrestle of Religion with Truth*, pp. 181 *ff.*
[18] *Issues of Life.* (Abington.) p. 162.

He is not the ideal, and he is not a personal agent guaranteeing the continued existence of human values. He is the order through which values may be achieved.

God is impersonal and 'more than mind.'[19] But Weiman defined personality in terms of social psychology:

> 'Personality is that which communicates and hence which shares experience. . . . It is not an end in itself, it is a means to an end.'[20]

It is one essential factor in attaining supreme value; but it is not the greatest value. God, then, is not a personality. He is something greater which man must serve.

> 'The greatness of personality lies in the fact that it can serve that order of existence and possibility in which are found the greatest values that can ever be achieved. God is that order. God is the personality-producing process of the universe, to use the expression of Shailer Mathews.'[21]

It seems to the writer that Wieman hesitates to ascribe personality and mind to God because such terms would limit God. Mind and personality are both limited categories. Wieman is very much aware of the greatness and glory of God, and he will not use categories which limit the magnitude of God.

> 'I hold that God towers in unique majesty infinitely above the little hills which we call minds and personalities. For ages men looked down to find God, among animals and plants and physical things. At last they learned to look horizontally at personalities. Some day they may learn to look up to see God in a summit that reaches high above mind and personality. I claim that when we try to apply these concepts of mind and personality to a reality so rich and great as God, we have to stretch them so far that they split and break to pieces. . . . *God is more than we can think.*'[22]

Wieman's 'experimental theology' is perhaps the most original of the three men treated in this paper. His stimulating treatment of mind and personality differentiates him from the more conservative thinking of Horton and Macintosh.

Walter Marshall Horton and Realistic Theology.

Professor Horton is strictly a theologian. He has as wide a knowledge of psychology as Professor Wieman, but has not been swayed to such an extent. He acknowledges his indebted-

[19] See the brilliant exchange of articles between Wieman and Robert Lowry Calhoun in *Christendom* (Willett, Clark), Vols. I and II, 1935-1937.

[20] *Issues of Life*, pp. 209, 213.

[21] *Ibid.*, pp. 227, 229.

[22] *Christendom*, 1: 432. Italics mine.

ness to both Wieman and Macintosh for the

> 'conviction that the empirical method offers the best approach to theological questions, and the field of theology is therefore as broad as the whole field of human knowledge.' [23]

Religious knowledge is based on intuitions which have been verified. But the religious problem is more difficult than the scientific task because of the nature of the Object whose objective validity must be established and because of the little understood mental procedure of attaining the primary intuition. Religious knowledge is vague and private. It

> 'begins with intuition, parallel to the intuition which gives birth to a scientific hypothesis, and likewise is based upon a problem situation, and a wide induction from experience in search of a solution. This intuition is then elaborated by reasoning, until it becomes the basis of a whole system of theology, with a system of ethics as its practical corollary, and a civilization as its concrete embodiment. . . . For the full testing of a religious hypothesis, centuries are required.' [24]

Theology may be divided into three sections :

> '*scientific* (proved and tested, confirmed by all competent authorities); *philosophic* (reasoned convictions involving value judgments and hence not scientific, but supported by much evidence); *practical* (affirmations of religious faith and hope, venturing out beyond the realm of the known, but based on knowledge and reasoned convictions).' [25]

Scientific theology must be the basis of authority for all forms of religious belief. The concepts of revelation must be brought back into religion, using them not as infallible guides but as tested insights of religious geniuses, which are empirical.'[26]

Except for the additional elements beyond science, Horton and Wieman are at one in their epistemology. But they vary a good deal in their descriptions of the religious Object. We must be careful not to define God in too utilitarian a manner (as Horton claims Wieman and Macintosh do).[27] He suggests the following definition :

> 'The divine Object' is 'that which humbles him who beholds it, and exalts him who reverently adjusts himself to it; or again, that which deserves supreme devotion, and repays such devotion with supreme fullness of life.'

It might be objected that this presupposes value, which is out

[23] *Contemporary American Theology*, Vol. I, p. 187.
[24] *Theism and the Scientific Spirit* (Harper), pp. 179-180.
[25] 'Authority without Infallibility,' in *Religious Realism*, p. 282 (abridged).
[26] Cf. 'The Validity of the Concept of Revelation in an Empirical Age,' in *The Process of Religion*. (Macmillan.) Ed. by M. H. Krumbine.
[27] Cf. *Religious Realism*, p. 289.

of place in science. Horton argues, however, on the basis of relativity, that

> 'goodness and beauty inhere in the general structure of events, and depend not only upon human desire, but quite as truly and even more significantly upon their cosmic Source.'

They are not projected into the universe! The attempt must be made

> 'to isolate the constant factor in the religious experience, which points to a dependable cosmic Ground.' [28]

The basis for intuition of the religious Fact is experience. There are degrees of objectivity in the experience. Even auto-suggestion has some objective value. But the pole of objectivity is reached when one is in the fullness of contemplation, for here the subject becomes entirely un-self-conscious:

> 'The acme is reached when one gets so completely inside the object that one can, so to speak, look back through the very eyes of the object.' [29]

In the search after the God of religious experience, we first discover that God is my own better self. This cannot mean, solipsism, for the replenishment of the self includes contact with one's fellow-men. We must go on to say that God is all that is best in our human heritage. The cardinal principle here is:

> 'Call nothing God that is not clearly an influence for good, however great and powerful it may be.' [30]

We must see through all man's lesser goods to what is truly worthful. For

> 'he who can live in a world of joy and light with only blackness in his heart has somehow lost the way.' [31]

Our third step is the claim that

> 'God is a vast cosmic drift or trend toward harmony, fellowship, and mutual aid, whereby our efforts to create a just equilibrium in human affairs are supported and sustained. . . . *I do not mean to assert the existence of such a cosmic drift as an act of faith; I claim that it is an empirical fact, capable of social verification.*' [32]

This is as far as science can go. The men whose positions we are considering are agreed on the verified knowledge of such a 'cosmic drift,' 'pattern of integration,' 'growth of meaning and value,' or, in the words of Macintosh, a 'divine value-

[28] *Ibid.*, pp. 290-291.
[29] *Psychological Approach to Theology* (Harper), pp. 201-202.
[30] *Theism and the Modern Mood*, p. 109.
[31] Ray O. Miller, *Modernist Studies in the Life of Jesus* (Sherman, French), p. 30.
[32] *Modern Mood*, p. 117. Italics mine.

producing Factor.' But Horton goes beyond science, and on the basis of assured convictions *not* empirically verified, proclaims that God is great enough and good enough to inspire our trust and love. God is purposive and is conscious of himself and the world:

> 'The divine organism has an intelligence of higher-than-human order, and the divine community has a governing head.' [33]

It is what Horton calls 'practical theology' which takes us to the God we need. And He is beyond verification!

In Horton's later writings, there is a definite trend away from the sense that God must be good at any cost. Realism demands that God have power, even though that may mean the presence of almost devilish factors. God must be conceived

> 'as a general impersonal principle of justice, like that perceived by the prophets; and as a dynamic principle of saving grace, like that experienced by the apostles.' [34]

This is the God who says:

> '"If you will hear my Word, you may yet make the great soulless machine of your industrial civilization an instrument for the common good and a bond of fellowship between you; but if not, then I will smash your civilization, and reduce you to a more primitive level of existence where you *must* recover the art of fellowship, which your pioneering forefathers knew, and you have lost."' [35]

This is the moral challenge which religious realism presents to a world which has little morale, little guidance, and no courage. It is such a God that we must face.

Douglas Clyde Macintosh and Critical Monism.

Of the three 'Religious Realists' here presented, Professor Macintosh is the only one who has developed a complete theory of knowledge. The other two began by assuming the 'epistemology of scientific method,' which is not adequately defined by them. Macintosh has developed a 'critical monistic realism' which seems to be adequate. A short discussion of it may well clarify some of the points in the former sections.

'Critical Monism' assumes that the knowing subject and the perceived object exist independently of each other, but that in the knowledge process there is partial immediacy. In other

[33] *Psychological Approach to Theology*, p. 237.
[34] *Realistic Theology*, p. 112. Cf. *Theism and Scientific Spirit*, pp. 206 *ff*; *Contemporary English Theology*, pp. 167 *ff*.
[35] *Realistic Theology*, p. 113.

words, there is 'partial identity' between subject and object, but what is immediately perceived is not wholly as it is perceived to be. To a certain extent, which never can be exactly determined, we have direct awareness, but this does not lead to truth without verification, and only objects which can be immediately experienced can be partially verified, and frequently completely verified.[36] The test of a true concept is threefold: intellectualism, which demands coherence; pragmatism, which demands that the hypothesis *work*; and immediate experience or intuition in a crucial experiment. But most of our religious beliefs are not equal to scientific knowledge. There is room for that which approaches truth, and which Macintosh calls 'reasonable belief'; there is an even lower stratum, where there are permissible 'surmises.' These categories closely resemble those of Horton.

God is known *scientifically* (verified knowledge) as an *immanent*, divine value-producing Factor. Through religious experience we discover that God is that

> 'factor which responds *dependably* to persistence in the right specifically religious adjustment, by promoting goodness of will and effectiveness in its activity.'[37]
>
> 'We have essentially scientific knowledge of a process immanent in the universe and in man which is divine in value—a divine behaviour of which we have to some extent discovered the conditions.'

Concerning the other aspects of deity, we have no direct awareness or verified knowledge. We may 'reasonably believe' in other aspects of the religious Object, provided they are consistent with our verified knowledge of the universe. For, according to the doctine of 'Moral Optimism,'

> 'we have a right to believe as we must in order to live as we ought, if we can—logically and psychologically.'[39]

On the basis of moral optimism, we may reasonably believe that God is transcendent, adequately preserving values, independently of man. God as transcendent (believed in) and immanent (known) producer of values may be believed to act *as if* intelligent and good. That He is therefore intelligent and good may be *surmised*. We may surmise, furthermore, that what we know of God, what we may reasonably believe, and what we surmise, refer to one and the same God. God includes the elements of

[36] 'Experimental Realism in Religion,' in *Religious Realism*, pp. 331-4.
[37] *Ibid.*, p. 400. [38] *Ibid.*, p. 401. [39] *Ibid.*, p. 405.

personality, but may be super-personal. We may believe in a God

> 'as a power great enough and good enough to meet the imperative needs of man as a free but fallible and ultimately dependent being; and secondly, as involved in and involving the other, the full conservation of all the essential values of human personality, and so the conscious persistence of all human personalities of actually or potentially good will, even in spite of physical death.' [40]

Professor Macintosh has come nearer to the traditional theology of Christianity than the other two, but he warns one against assuming that the God of verified knowledge is the Christian God. All we know (and Wieman and Horton would agree) is that

> 'on condition of the right religious adjustment, a Factor or Reality, which we may call God, conditions in the individual, primarily in the will but ultimately in the nature more generally, the characteristic religious experience of moral and religious salvation.' [41]

A more-than-human Power does function, and mankind may tap this reservoir of strength and comfort and co-operate with that Power which is God to bring about the realization of ever higher human values.

The Value of Religious Realism.

To claim that religious realism has given us new knowledge about God or man would be a misinterpretation of the movement. All that religious realism has done is to take the *data* of human experience, and especially religious experience, and to interpret it in terms which will be of value for the present generation. The attempt has been to discover more accurately just what God is and is not. Wieman, Horton, and Macintosh have provided the leadership which makes it possible for others to understand the whole movement. The distinctions between verified empirical knowledge (about which all three men are in general agreement) and reasonable belief (where all three disagree) are important if we are ever to think clearly about these things.

Macintosh, in particular, feels that Wieman has been wrong in denying personality and mind to God. There is no empirical justification for such claims, and Wieman, to remain true to his exact method, should remain agnostic. But if Wieman

> 'persists in denying to God all that is essentially personal, all rationality, all intelligence, all volition, then those who know where the true values lie will turn from him, sadly, as from a false prophet.' [42]

[40] *Pilgrimage of Faith* (U. of Calcutta), p. 206.
[41] *Is there a God?* p. 256.
[42] *Is there a God?* p. 251.

This problem cannot be solved by empiricism, because we cannot have direct experience of mind and personality. We experience its *functioning*. So Macintosh claims that God acts *as if* intelligent and personal, and therefore we may surmise that He is intelligent and personal, in the sense that He is a knower who is capable of conscious social relations with man. But to say this is to argue from analogy and not from direct experience. The rigid empiricist must remain agnostic on this point.

Religious realism has given us a method for determining the presence in experience and in the world of a process of growth of meaning and value; it gives us evidence of a cosmic drift; it seems to indicate a divine value-producing Factor. This *must* be the starting point of any empirical theology. Philosophical speculation begins at this point. And if the speculation includes good metaphysics and good religion, the results may be a new theism which will once again unite intelligent theologians.

BUDDHISM AND CHRISTIAN ORIGINS

By H. G. Rawlinson, M.A., C.I.E.,
sometime Principal of the Deccan College, Poona, author of
Intercourse between India and the Western World, etc.

THE parallels between the lives of Buddha and Jesus have long been noted by Orientalists, but have received scant attention from students of the origin of the Gospels. Gautama Buddha, the great Indian religious reformer, appears to have lived from 563 to 483 B.C., in what is at present known as Bihar in the north-east of India. Contemporary thought was dominated by the quest for release from the endless cycle of incarnations which hold the soul earthbound. Rebirth was due to *Karma*, or the result of actions in former lives. Buddha claimed to have found a practical way of release from *Karma*, by right living, right thinking and universal charity. He made no claim to godhead: in fact, on the question of God he maintained an agnostic attitude. At his death, his disciples met and collected all the details and incidents of the Master's life and teaching which they could recollect. They were not written down, but, according to the universal Indian custom, were recited by the whole synod and committed to memory. This body of tradition

consisted of sermons, tales, hymns, sayings, and rules of conduct; prominent among them were the *Jatakas* or birth-stories, charming old folk-tales adapted for the purpose of illustrating the manner in which the Buddha, in former lives, had devoted himself to help his fellow-creatures. From this the Buddhist Canon was constituted by the Emperor Asoka in 240 B.C. Gradually, however, the Buddha was deified, and in the first century A.D. he appears not as a dead Teacher, but a living God, the latest of a series of incarnations of the Buddha Spirit for the salvation of the whole human race. As the Buddha was now a divinity, it was necessary to furnish his birth, career and death with appropriate miraculous incidents. These were collected into a poetical biography, the *Lalita Vistara*, popularly known to English readers from Sir Edwin Arnold's rendering, *The Light of Asia*. We must distinguish sharply between the teacher Gautama as depicted in the Canon of the *Hinayana* or Little Vehicle, and the deified Gautama Buddha of the *Mahayana* or Great Vehicle.

It is only natural to expect closer parallels between the Gospels and the Mahayana version, which are nearer in time, than the more primitive Hinayana. Yet the latter provides some remarkable coincidences. In *Jataka* 78, we find a story of Gautama going on his daily tour of begging, and finding only a single cake in his alms-bowl. With this he feeds, not only five hundred brethren, but all the inhabitants of the monastery, and so much is left over that it has to be buried in a hole near the gateway. It is interesting to note in the Gospel narrative of the miraculous feeding of the five and four thousand (Mark vi, 34-44; viii, 1-8) that mention is also made of 'the fragments that remained.' *Jataka* 190 is the story of the absent-minded disciple who, his thoughts full of the Buddha, walked over a river. He reached mid-stream as though on dry land; then he suddenly noticed the waves, lost his nerve and began to sink. But by concentrating his mind on the Buddha, he managed to reach land safely. In Matthew xiv, 28-31, Peter, like his Buddhist prototype, began to sink 'when he saw that the wind was boisterous.' As Max Müller remarks, walking on the water is not in itself an uncommon miracle; but walking on the water by faith, and sinking for want of it, is a coincidence which can be accounted for

by historical contact and transference only.[1] That the Buddhist version has the priority is clearly shewn by the fact that the incident is depicted on the Sanchi Stupa, *circa* 200 B.C.

In the Mahayana tradition, the parallels are close and numerous. Buddha's birth is heralded by portents. He enters his mother's womb as a white elephant. A star appears in the heavens when he is born. The sage Asita prophesies that the infant is a future Buddha. At the time of his Enlightenment, Mara, the Tempter, offers to make him a Chakravartin, or Universal Ruler, it he will renounce his Buddhahood. He has twelve disciples, including Ananda, the beloved disciple, and Devadatta, the faithless disciple who betrays him and tries to compass his death. He is transfigured on the Vulture's Peak before his followers, and his body glows with a celestial radiance. At Vaisali he refuses a feast offered by the chief men, in order to partake of a meal prepared by the courtezan Ambapali. In the Mahayana discourse the Saddharma Pundarika, or Lotus of the Good Law, occurs a version of the Parable of the Prodigal Son. Here, however, the father tests the genuineness of his son's repentance by giving him all sorts of menial work to do, and only on his death-bed declares that this is his only son, for whose return he has longed all his life, and who will inherit all that he possesses.

It must be remembered that ever since 510 B.C., when Darius the Great sent a Greek mercenary, Scylax of Caryanda, to explore the Indus and return home by the Red Sea, intercourse between India and the West was almost uninterrupted. Eusebius has preserved a story from Aristoxenus the Musician of the Indian philosophers who went to Athens and interviewed Socrates. Garbe and others have been struck with the extraordinary resemblances between Orphism and Buddhism on the one hand, and between Plato's doctrine of the Ideas and the Vedanta philosophy on the other. Folk-stories which may be traced to the *Jatakas* crop up in the most unexpected way; Plato's *Cratylus*, for example, contains a reference to the well-known Indian fable of the ass in the lion's skin.[2] Alexander the

[1] *Coincidences*, Last Essays, Series I, p. 251.

[2] The evidence is summarized in *The Legacy of India* (Oxford, 1937), p. 1 *ff*.

Great brought back an Indian 'sophist' named Kalanos, who immolated himself on a pyre at Athens. The Maurya Emperors of Magadha or Bihar were in close touch with the successors of Alexander. During the reign of Chandragupta (322-289 B.C.) a Greek ambassador named Megasthenes resided at the court of Pataliputra (Patna). Asoka (273-232 B.C.) despatched Buddhist missionaries to his friends Ptolemy Philadelphus of Egypt, Antigonus Gonatas of Macedonia, Magas of Cyrene, and Alexander of Epirus. A Greek dynasty, expelled from Bactria by the Scythians, ruled in the Punjab about 200-100 B.C.; one of them, Milinda or Menander, whose capital was at Sagala (Sialkot), was converted to Buddhism. There is good evidence for the fact that the Apostle Thomas preached at the court of Gondopharnes, an Indo-Parthian king reigning at Taxila near the modern Rawalpindi; afterwards he fled, and took ship from the mouth of the Indus to Muziris or Cranganore on the Malabar coast, where there was a Roman colony. From here he went to Mylapore near Madras, where he was martyred.[3] The Kushan monarch Kanishka's capital, Peshawar, at the mouth of the Khyber Pass, was a centre where travellers from Asia Minor Persia, China and all parts of India met and exchanged ideas. Kanishka employed Greek sculptors to adorn the numerous Buddhist shrines and monasteries which he erected. One of his coins bears a standing figure of the Buddha, with the inscription BOΔΔO. He was an ardent Buddhist, and finding that Buddhism had greatly changed, he summoned a General Council, which formally drew up the Mahayana Canon. It is significant to note that it was evolved in a cosmopolitan and largely Hellenistic atmosphere. There is little doubt that Greek was commonly spoken in the Punjab and at the ports on the west coast of India. The discovery of the monsoon winds by Hippalus in about 45 A.D. brought India within two months of Alexandria by sea, and Alexandria became the great clearing-house of Eastern and Western culture.

> 'Nascent Christianity met full-grown Buddhism in the academies and markets of Asia and Egypt. . . . The ancient religion of Persia added to the ferment of human thought, excited by improved facilities for international communication.'[4]

[3] J. N. Farquhar, 'The Apostle Thomas in Southern India.' *John Rylands Library Bulletin*, 1927, p. 20.

[4] V. A. Smith, *Oxford History of India*, p. 134.

It would, of course, be absurd to suppose that the authors of the Gospels deliberately borrowed from the Buddha story, or *vice versâ*. Such a course of action is psychologically impossible. But it is improbable that any written accounts of the life of Jesus were compiled during the lifetime of those who saw and heard him. The earliest extant document, the Gospel according to Mark, is usually dated at not earlier than 67 A.D., and the words of Papias, quoted by Eusebius, are well known:

> 'John Mark, having become interpreter of Saint Peter, wrote down, *as far as he was able,* the things said or done by Christ.'

We all know how difficult it is to recall accurately any details of the life and sayings of someone, however vivid and striking his personality, who died in the reign of Edward VII. Canon Streeter gives a happy illustration from the difficulties he experienced in writing the life of the famous Christian Sadhu, Sunder Singh.[5] The Gospels are not formal biographies. Anecdotes which served to illustrate various aspects of the life of the Lord—His Messiahship, His power over Nature, His compassion—were gradually and insensibly incorporated, like the Buddhist *Jatakas*, first as parables, and then as facts. Their truth as von Hügel said, depends, not on their factual accuracy, but on the ideas and experiences symbolized. A miracle is an acted parable, a symbolic expression of a spiritual principle.

Perhaps we may find an apt illustration of how it happened in the famous romance of Barlaam and Josaphat.[6] Josaphat is a young Indian prince, born soon after the visit of the Apostle Thomas. At his birth it is prophesied that he will leave the world, and his father strives to keep him in seclusion. But, driving out with his charioteer, he encounters a blind man, an aged man, a leper and a dead man, and is so affected that he seeks out a saint named Barlaam, who converts him to Christianity. Afterwards he abandons the world and becomes a hermit. This story was translated into Greek, Syriac, Latin and practically every European language. Its vogue in the Middle Ages was immense. Josaphat became a Christian saint; he appears in the Greek Calendar for August 25th, and in the Roman Martyr-

[5] *The Four Gospels*, p. 134.

[6] Hastings, *Encyc. Religion and Ethics, s.v.*, Barlaam and Josaphat.

ology for November 27th. Yet modern research has shown without a shadow of doubt that Josaphat is the Bodhisattva, and the story is taken from the *Lalita Vistara*, probably through a lost Pehlevi version!

The late Professor C. W. Rhys Davids, in his *Hibbert Lectures* (1881) drew a striking parallel between the popular mentality in the Ganges valley in the sixth century B.C. and Judea at the time of the birth of Jesus. In northern India everyone was expecting the appearance of a great King of Righteousness, who should be all-powerful, all-good and all-wise, and should inaugurate a Golden Age. When Gautama appeared, with his new message of deliverance, it was only natural that he should be hailed as the expected King of Righteousness, and should, very soon after his decease, if not before it, have been endowed in popular imagination with the appropriate attributes. Indeed, he seems to have seen in himself some such person, as he claimed the title of Buddha, the Enlightened. So, too, the followers of Jesus readily saw in the Master the longed-for Messiah, and endowed Him with the qualities and powers which His Messiahship demanded. That there should be similarities between the two, both in the sources, political and spiritual, from which they sprang, and in their most essential features, is only natural, and makes the comparison deeply instructive. Professor Rhys Davids adds other tendencies—the desire to find in the infancy and boyhood of the world's great men prognostications of their future greatness, and the depraved love of the marvellous, which blinds narrators to the fact that miracles, so far from heightening, conceal and lower the true character of their hero. In the society in which Gautama and Jesus lived and taught, a natural belief in the miraculous and an abiding faith in the constant presence of supernatural beings and the constant action of supernatural causes, led them easily to see what they so fully expected to find. In the case of Jesus, the belief was strengthened by His undoubted powers of healing mental and nervous disorders. Those who are willing to discuss both religions on the same principles, says Rhys Davids, may expect to find in the early history of Buddhism not only a historical example by which they may test their methods of investigation, but a historical parallel from which they may expect to learn.

THE TERCENTENARY OF NICHOLAS FERRAR*

'Rich men furnished with ability living in their habitations.'
ECCLESIASTICUS lxiv, 8.

THIS text suggests two types now disappearing from our own countryside, the well-to-do gentlemanly squire and the well-to-do gentlemanly parson. Of course not all these rich men were furnished with ability, nor did they all live peaceably in their habitations, but when we have allowed for the brainless and the brutal, the narrow and the nasty, both these types have made for the advancement of our English civilization.

Occasionally such a man has used his opportunities for some definitely religious purpose. Thus about eighty years ago, Sir Frederick Ouseley, a clerical musician, devoted his money and his talent to the foundation of S. Michael's College, Tenbury (in the diocese of Hereford), where a good preparatory school is combined with the culture of music in a church still famed for its daily choral worship.

To-day we commemorate a religiously-minded English gentleman of the seventeenth century who died just 300 years ago, Nicholas Ferrar. The name may be remembered by any who have enjoyed the romance known as *John Inglesant*. Nicholas Ferrar was born in 1593, the son of a rich merchant of the City of London. At Cambridge he won distinction in various directions, including mathematics and medicine. After some years of travel he took over the management of the company that had colonized Virginia and proved himself an expert man of business. For a time he sat in Parliament and rendered the social service of impeaching a corrupt minister and ending his political career. Then at the age of 32 he decided to retire to an estate at Little Gidding, near Huntingdon. Here he restored a dilapidated country house and a small desecrated church, and in 1625 removed thither with his mother, his brother

* Sermon preached in the Temple Church on Sunday, December 5th, 1937, by Prebendary J. F. Clayton, M.C., M.A., Reader at the Temple Church.

John Ferrar and his wife and three children, his married sister with her husband and many children. With three schoolmasters and the servants the household numbered about forty, of whom the Ferrar family accounted for at least twenty-five. Surprising though it now sounds, this crowd of relatives lived together in peace. Their activities included a school, dispensary, and the art of bookbinding; life was simple and, to our way of thinking, severe; and all was permeated by the observances of religion which included numerous short services in the house together with Morning and Evening Prayer and Litany in the adjacent church. Ferrar took Deacon's Orders, but refused to proceed to become a presbyter.

The Sunday régime is interesting if only as a contrast to the present day; after early devotions, the household proceeded to the church for morning prayer at 9. At 10.30 they were joined by the Vicar and congregation of the adjoining parish of Steeple Gidding; Ferrar then read the Ante-Communion Service and the Vicar preached; on the first Sunday in the month the Sacrament was dispensed at this service with simple dignity after much preparation. Children from the neighbourhood assisted in the saying (or perhaps the singing) of the psalms, and were afterwards invited to dine at the house; at 2 the household went to the neighbouring church for Evening Prayer and another sermon; the rest of the day was spent quietly as each wished, and the day closed at 8 p.m.

Ferrar numbered among his friends George Herbert, the Vicar of Bemerton, near Salisbury; and at Little Gidding he expressed the same type of austere Anglican piety, with no tendencies towards Roman Catholic devotions or teaching, such as Herbert practised as 'a country parson.' Nicholas Ferrar died on December 4th, 1637, but the household continued under his brother John Ferrar for another twenty years, except for a brief period during the Civil War when the house was sacked by Puritan soldiers. After the death of the senior members of the family, the household broke up; a nephew and a grand-nephew attaining to some distinction as clergymen. The manor house has long since gone but the church remains, an interesting example of a country church furnished in the style approved by

Archbishop Laud. Not far off is another church restored by George Herbert with the help of the Ferrars, both of them attractive to anyone interested in English church history.

To professional men worshipping in this chapel of the law, Ferrar is not likely to make much appeal; they will say that Ferrar could only live as he did because he was blessed with a private fortune, whereas they have to earn their living; that in these days five-and-twenty relatives could not live together in peace, and that no children would stand the discipline which included very early hours and the learning by heart of passages of the Bible; that it is nobler, because harder, to behave like a Christian in the world of business or public life than to retire from such responsibilities; that in the history of the seventeenth century they are more attracted by statesmen like Strafford or Cromwell, or lawyers like Selden; that in religion they, and perhaps we, should have been on the side of the Puritan, or at least the Calvinist, members of the Church of England rather than on the side of Archbishop Laud, with whom Ferrar was on terms of friendship. These criticisms have weight; and yet Nicholas Ferrar had made his name as an honourable man of affairs before he retired; and perhaps Little Gidding was a haven of peace to many who had had enough both of the Court of Charles I and of the political and religious quarrels which were soon to burst out in civil war. Ferrar is sometimes regarded as the forerunner of the many religious communities that have been established in the Church of England during the last eighty years.

These include numerous sisterhoods; and, for men, the communities of the clergy at Cowley and at Mirfield (employed largely in preaching and mission work); the Society of the Sacred Mission, which includes laymen; the small Benedictine Community at Nashdom in Buckinghamshire; and several Franciscan brotherhoods which minister to the friendless and destitute. However distasteful such a life may be to us, it is well that the few who have that vocation can respond to it within our reformed and comprehensive Church; but these communities, bound by the vows of poverty, celibacy and obedience, seem to me to have little in common with the family of Nicholas Ferrar, which was bound by no such vows. Possibly the spirit of Little

Gidding was revived in the groups of University graduates who prepared themselves for ordination in the Temple under the guidance of Dr. Vaughan, and my own experience at Ely thirty years ago leads me to add that this type of consecrated family life is possible at a good theological college.

But the obvious counterpart of Little Gidding is some Christian home where refinement and peace, simplicity of life with useful social activities, are consecrated by the observance of the Christian religion, less intense than those of the Ferrars, but not less sincere. Such homes, where they exist, are a haven of peace from the noise and vulgarity, the gossip and intrigue, the aimless rush after pleasure which make the twentieth century a time as difficult as the seventeenth.

I have alluded to the romance *John Inglesant*. The author makes Inglesant, a courtier with an adventurous future, spend a Communion Sunday at Little Gidding, and years afterwards the memory of that Sunday saved him from yielding to a fatal temptation. Possibly some men whose lives are very much 'in the world' are kept straight by the memories of a similar friendship associated perhaps with a Communion Sunday in a country church.

Even when one visits Little Gidding, those times seem remote, and we have to face the situation of 1937, not of 1637; yet the present is the heir of the past, and in the rich heritage of English religious life an attractive contribution was made by that English Christian gentleman Nicholas Ferrar.

BOOK REVIEWS

NEW STONES AND UNTEMPERED MORTAR*

The method of the author, as described by himself, is to try to build up a coherent edifice from the loose stones which the critics have left lying about, using perhaps a little imagination for mortar, and exercising at times a certain freedom of choice where doctors disagree. From this it will be seen that he is writing for those who are making their first study of the Old Testament. Two things about his method are to be strongly commended: he encourages the student to read the Bible for himself, and he presents the story as the life of real men inspired by the Spirit of God. His attitude towards the critics, however, is not too fortunate, for he falls

* Stephen L. Caiger: *Lives of the Prophets*, the later history of Israel told in a series of biographies of the writing prophets. (S.P.C K. 1936. 5/-.)

between two stools, pleasing neither those who accept nor those who reject the work of the critics. We can forgive him for not mentioning the doubts that many scholars have about the pre-exilic Messianic prophecies, but not for completely ignoring the critical conclusions about the return from Exile. After describing how a prince of the royal house of David, one Sheshbazzar or Zerebbabel, headed the procession, accompanied by a young man Joshua, son of one Jozadak, of the priestly family of Zadok, he continues,

> 'Some thousands of their fellow-countrymen, riding on camels, or asses, or in covered wagons, and protected by out-riders from the Persian army, made up the happy throng, as they traversed once more the route marked out by their forefather Abraham some fifteen centuries earlier, from the city of the Chaldees to the land of the Canaan.'

It makes a pretty story (though unfortunately entirely unhistorical), and one cannot help feeling that the author has inserted it simply because it is a pretty story. In fact the amount of play he allows to his imagination is far more than is necessary to act as mortar to the facts that criticism has hewn out. It will be hard for the beginner to know that there is no evidence whatever for the surmise that 'the obvious inspiration and timeliness of his (Amos's) message very quickly secured for him full recognition by the regular prophetical schools.' Referring to the early days of the kingdom he says, 'When the clash of arms died down, they (the prophetic guilds) still declared a state of national emergency, a holy war against Baal, Moloch, Milcom and all other idolatrous rivals of the One True God.' It would be difficult to find more anachronisms in one short sentence. The universalism of Third Isaiah is praised in these words, 'The Gentiles not only seek after God if haply they may find Him, but they shall be welcomed into the full fellowship of faithful Israel'—a curious kind of fellowship in which strangers are to labour at building the walls and their kings to be servants of the Jews. All in all, the tone of the book is good, and the idea of using imagination to make the scenes live is excellent, but we cannot recommend it to students until it has been revised and its inaccuracies corrected.

L. E. Browne.

THE MODERN DILEMMA*

Of the three allegiances offered to us to-day—Christianity, Fascism and Communism, one is old and the others new.

Although a knowledge of the ingredients of a mixture does not guarantee knowledge of the mixture itself—since an organized whole is other than its parts—yet no one can understand Christianity without knowing something of its historical make-up.

Christianity may have started off as a revolutionary and hence anti-classical and anti-rational affair, since it began with the proletariat and not

* *Christianity, Communism and the Ideal Society.* By James Feibleman. (Allen & Unwin. 1937. 12/6.)

with the governing and owning classes. But faith must be defended by reason if it is to live, and Christianity rapidly realized this truth and came to terms with the Platonic philosophy.

Of Platonism there are two brands, both originating in the works of the master:

> "Plato in some passages writes as though he intended reality to apply to a realm of essence, of which the actual world is an imperfect and unreal shadow. This is instanced by the cave analogy (*Republic*, 514a-521c). In other passages he seems to intend a reality reaching equally to all existence, so that actuality is a fragmentary and incomplete but entirely real part of the whole of reality. This is instanced by the sunlight analogy (*Parmenides*, 131), in which the Ideas are compared with sunlight which is nowhere complete but everywhere real sunlight.'

Of these two brands of Platonism it was the former, i.e., the 'Shadow' version, that was taken over by Christianity; and this led inevitably to a certain contempt and neglect of actuality, which was destined to prove a weakness in that religion.

Augustine in particular was responsible for foisting upon the Church this 'shadow' brand of Platonism. When Alaric sacked Rome, he wrote a book to show that the actual Rome which had been sacked was not real at all; and that there was a city 'eternal in the heavens' which could not be sacked by anyone—for such is the gist of the *De Civitate Dei*. He also taught that reality lay, not in the actual world, but with a transcendent God. Hence the world of actuality was left devoid of value and human nature devoid of goodness. World pessimism and 'shadow' Platonism became bedfellows.

The failure of Christianity to take actuality into account met its nemesis later when the pendulum swung back. The Protestant Reformation is usually supposed to have been the first serious attack on Catholic theology, but as a matter of fact the Reformers swallowed Augustine nearly whole. Truth to tell, there were equally or more acute thinkers in the mediæval period, and it was the Nominalist scholastics who ripped the seamlesss garb of dogma from top to toe. Their object was to 'debunk' Plato—the mortar which held the fabric of Christian theology together.

Nominalism insists that 'universals' and Platonic 'Ideas' are fictions created by the human mind; and stands for the sole reality of physical particulars—i.e., of the crude, concrete actuality which the senses perceive. Thus the 'real' world of Christian theology—'eternal in the heavens'—was pure moonshine. Berengar and Roscellinus sent ranging shots at the Catholic position, but were forced to retract. Abelard suggested a modified version of the heresy and was too clever for his opponents, though they got him at last.

The point to note is that these early 'nominalists' were the direct ancestors of the empirical philosophers of the seventeenth and eighteenth

centuries, as well as of the scientists and materialists of the nineteenth. Roscellinus was the begetter of Rousseau and the whole tribe of liberals, democrats, not to mention our latter-day communists. All were bred out of a reaction against the 'shadow' Platonism of Augustinian orthodoxy.

But the curious thing is that although natural science was one of the chief products of the nominalist revolt, inasmuch as this created the conditions under which science could survive and flourish (by weakening the strangle-hold of Catholic dogma), *scientific method itself is not nominalist, but realist*—though this fact is usually overlooked. One of the most valuable features of Mr. Feibleman's book is that he emphasises this point:

> 'The philosophy of science is that of realism. According to its nominalistic creed there is no real and independent logical order, no world of universal functions. But the existence of such a logical order is demanded by the procedure of science. The necessary employment of universals signifies that there are real elements involved in scientific method which candidly do *not* refer to physical particulars; and therefore the claim of nominalism in science is denied.'[1]

Thus natural science has more than a little, in fact an essential principle, in common with Platonism; indeed, most interesting parallels could be drawn between the two. But it is clear that science has nothing in common with the 'shadow' version of Platonism—according to which the actual world is unreal. The realism of science is more akin to the *Parmenides* version, according to which the actual is not devoid of reality.

This is very important—that science should be recognised as being realist, not nominalist—though its realism is not of the kind which is found fossilized in the rock of Catholic orthodoxy. The neo-scholasticism of Feibleman is not that of Maritain and the neo-catholic apologists.

But what has this to do with out present dilemma?—Does it help us to decide between the rival claimants on our loyalty? We see on the one hand that orthodox Catholicism is the product of a type of realism ('shadow' Platonism) which science rejects. We see also that Fascism is the product of a nominalism which has run to seed and become non-rational—indeed, anti-rational. As for Communism, it is the product of a materialism which is itself the child of nominalism, but it is realist in its method, like science, for the rational order of things is to it real.

Can a new order of society be constructed out of the sound elements in Christianity and Communism? Mr. Feibleman thinks so, and it is because his brilliant philosophical analysis is made a basis for socially constructive ideas, that his book is of such importance. It is written in a forcible, lucid, restrained style which is all too rare in works of this character.

J. C. HARDWICK.

[1] p. 297. In this work the term 'realist' has its proper scholastic, not its modern, connotation. The realist believes in the reality of universals, the nominalist in the reality of particulars only.

TIME AND ETERNITY*

Like Dr. Albert Schweitzer, Mr. Brabant returns from the mission field in Africa to give his fellow-Christians in Europe some fruits of his meditations in the silences of the Dark Continent. He asks to be condoned for lack of references to recent books on his subject, which could hardly be expected of a missionary in any fullness. He may be assured that, whatever his shortcomings in this respect, he has made a valuable contribution towards the solution of deep problems in metaphysical theology.

The lectures are in two equal parts: first, a succinct exposition of the course of previous thought on the subject, from Plato to Dr. Whitehead; secondly, his own speculations. Inevitably there are considerable omissions. Indian philosophy is outside the purview, since he is concerned primarily only with Christian thought, and he summarizes the ideas of Plato, Aristotle, and Plotinus simply because of their influence on Catholic theologians. He mentions Dionysius only in a quotation by Aquinas. And he passes over altogether John Scotus Erigena, one of the most powerful and exalted of the metaphysical theologians of the world. A Bampton lecturer, if he undertakes a vast subject such as this, has to submit to severe limitations, seeing that he has barely eight hours at his disposal to read what he has written. He did well to leave himself four of those hours for the expression of his own thoughts, and to this we turn, hoping to find some light on fundamental enigmas.

He acknowledges that he has been helped by Dr. Whitehead in his views of time or the temporal process. Time, he argues, is not mere succession; Bergson with his doctrine of *durée* gets us beyond that. But Whitehead objects to Bergson's isolation and apotheosis of the natural flux. There are 'eternal concepts' which determine the course of events. So, Mr. Brabant maintains, there are certain 'eternal values' which determine and manifest themselves in time, introducing patterns which transcend the flux. This is peculiarly apparent in music, which unites successions of notes into harmonious wholes, making them in some sense co-existent. Thus, in general, the eternal reveals itself, or Himself, in the temporal through the supreme values, of which Mr. Brabant enumerates beauty, purpose, truth, goodness, holiness.

Mr. Brabant betrays a predilection for the view expressed by Dr. Inge in his book, *God and the Astronomers*, that this world-order will cease with the dissipation of energy equally through space, though there may be other, perhaps an infinite number, of world-orders both before and after. Be this so or not, we are faced with the question, 'Why, from a Being which is Perfection itself, should there arise an imperfect process of becoming? He inclines to Plato's answer in the *Timaeus*, that God, being free from jealousy, desired that there should be other beings as like himself as possible. He then proceeds to discuss 'newness' and the compatibility of Divine

* *Time and Eternity in Christian Thought.* The Bampton Lectures of 1936. By F. H. Brabant. (Longmans. 1937. 15/-.)

foreknowledge with human freedom. But he does not seriously attack the problem why Perfection should give rise, not to more perfection, but to such a very imperfect world as this, so unlike the Deity. Now this omission, or burking, of this very critical and vital problem is, I submit, due to a defective conception of 'becoming' as a whole. Mr. Brabant apparently looks upon Creation as consisting of innumerable movements, more or less in the right direction, instead of as, ideally at least, one great process of the becoming good which is destined ultimately to return to the Perfection whence it sprang. The modern philosophy of evolution might have suggested this; also the mediaeval theology of Erigena. And this might have led on to the thought that Eternal Being would be somehow incomplete without temporal becoming—a becoming which starts from God and returns to God. And this, in turn, might have pointed to a more acceptable conception of the ultimate destiny of the 'lost' than those which he very tentatively puts forward.

Mr. Brabant has given us a volume of considerable learning, adorned with poetical quotations and other literary references, and thoughtful reflections on some of the mysteries of existence. But there are too many loose ends in his reasoning, too much diffuseness in spite of its comparative brevity. His treatment of the main theme lacks that rounded appearance, or that suggestion of converging lines leading on and up and away, which we cannot help desiderating. All the same, in various respects it prepares the way for such a satisfying philosophy of time and eternity.

FREDERICK A. M. SPENCER.

HOW TO INTERPRET THE PARABLES*

A thorough lucid and illuminating book fully abreast with modern research, and demanding careful study for the help it gives to a right understanding of Christ's parables and their importance. The first part is an introduction dealing with the history and nature of parables, the second part a commentary on the parables themselves. The word parable is commonly used in LXX to translate the Hebrew word *marshal*, which appears originally to have been used to denote a popular saying or proverb, and later attained a wider connotation; after examining a number of relevant passages in the Old Testament, the author reaches the conclusion that

> 'seen against the background of *Talmud* and *Midrash*, the Gospel parables are revealed, as supremely beautiful examples of an established art.'

Turning to the Gospel parables he distinguishes the similitude from a simile or metaphor by the fact that it depicts familiar scenes and relationships in some detail. Parable again is distinguished from similitude because it gives the illustration in narrative form.

> 'The similitude is a picture of familiar happenings, the parable depicts something as having once happened.'

* *The Parables of the Synoptic Gospels*. B. T. D. Smith, D.D. (Cambridge University Press. 1937. 12/6.)

Four of the Gospel parables, he thinks, stand in a class by themselves (the Pharisee and the Publican, the Rich Fool, Dives and Lazarus, and the Good Samaritan) because they do not teach by analogy but directly by giving examples of character and conduct to be imitated or avoided. Parable again is distinguished from allegory, because it compares one thing with another, whereas allegory substitutes one thing for another. He illustrates this distinction by the parable of the Wicked Husbandmen.

> 'The fact that the Wicked Husbandmen in its present form is allegory and not parable is evident. The story is intelligible when it is interpreted as a thinly veiled prophecy of the fate of Jewish leaders and rulers who have crowned a long series of outrages upon God's prophets by the crucifixion of Christ; it lacks all verisimilitude when read as an account of what might happen in daily life. A landlord is not likely to continue sending slaves to collect his rent when one after another they are mishandled or killed; above all, he is not likely to risk the sending of his son and heir on such a dangerous errand as a last resort: tenant farmers are not likely to suppose that by the murder of the heir they would obtain possession of the estate, and landlords are not usually free to execute their tenants.'

This not only illustrates the difference between allegory and parable, but shows that the primitive Church had a tendency to regard some of Christ's parables as allegories; a tendency which might easily, and probably did, affect the form of the parable in the course of its transmission, so that some of Christ's parables may have been preserved in the Gospels, not as he originally spoke them, but in an allegorized form. Speaking of Mark's view that Jesus spoke in parables so that they who were without might not understand he makes the very acute remark that

> 'the Marcan theory registers the fact that some of the parables had become obscure with the loss of their context.'

Many of the parables and figurative sayings at one time existed apart from their contexts, and the contexts in which they occur in the Gospels are not always appropriate and perhaps even sometimes misleading. It is possible, but not certain, that collections consisting entirely of parables at one time existed, and if this be so, it is obvious that the settings in which they appear are due to the Evangelists themselves. Collections of parables were, he thinks, made at quite an early date for the purpose of instructing converts, especially Gentile converts. When the parables were used for such teaching a new application could be given to them,

> 'the parable of the Sower could be applied to the history of the Christian mission. . . . The parable of the mustard seed was seen to illustrate the growth of the Church,'

although its original purpose was probably only to show that great things may have but small beginnings. It is possible that some of the parables may have been created by Christian teachers, others borrowed from Jewish sources (this seems to us to be probable of the parable of Dives and Lazarus). But allowing for this possibility the majority of the parables no doubt go back originally to Christ himself. The moral tags appended to

some of the parables probably do not really belong to them, for they are not always appropriate, e.g., 'Many were called but few chosen' at the end of the parable of the labourers in the vineyard.

The last two chapters of the Introduction deal with the background of the parables, and the Gospel of the parables, respectively; in them Dr. Smith shows how the conditions of contemporary life provide the subject matter of the parables and how the leading ideas of the Gospel of Christ are illustrated by them.

In the Commentary which forms the second part of the book he divides the parables into six classes—'parables of the times,' 'parables of growth,' etc., and gives a careful and lucid exposition of each parable in turn. His aim is always to teach the particular lesson which each parable was intended to enforce, for it is of the very essence of a parable that it should enforce one lesson and one only. This explains the existence of such apparently strange parables as the Widow and the Judge who feared not God nor regarded man, and the Unjust Steward. The point of the one is that one must persevere in prayer, of the other that it is worth while to be prudent. Of the parable of the Unjust Steward Dr. Smith very shrewdly observes,

> 'the fact that we do not expect such a tale to be used to enforce a religious lesson appears to me an almost unanswerable argument in favour of the authenticity of this parable.'

It would be attractive to go through the commentary on the parables and point out many of the pregnant and illuminating comments the author makes, but of them there are so many that once one began it would be difficult to know where to stop. It must suffice then to say that it is as thorough as it is interesting and as interesting as it is thorough; the whole book indeed, both introduction and commentary, will amply repay not only the reading but prolonged and minute study for it is a monument of ripe and well-balanced scholarship.

E. R. Buckley.

DEATH OR DOGMA*

By this challenging title the author expresses his conviction that the only hope for the world lies in the acceptance of dogmatic Christianity. Humanism is not enough, secularism is powerless, only by the recognition of the sovereignity of God and the dignity of man as expressed in the fundamental verities of the Christian Faith can the world's pressing problems find a solution.

This is a promising theme, and Mr. Mascall's book is sure to be read with sympathy. But it will be read also with disappointment. The style is breezy, and there is much of what Mr. W. G. Peck in a Foreword describes as 'Jolly humour'; but that too is not enough. The author has two great faults which spoil his work, he is ignorant or contemptuous of biblical criticism, and he displays a narrowness of outlook which prevents him from showing any sympathy with those who do not agree with his views. Thus

* *Death or Dogma.* By E. L. Mascall. (S.P.C.K. 1937. 3/6.)

he does less than justice to his own generation. All Christians must deplore the attitude of the secularists, but it is not true that secularism is concerned only with material gains; many of them are men of high ideals. Nor is it true that modern education is entirely regardless of spiritual needs, and it is ungenerous to say that in England time in school is allowed for religious instruction and organized prayers only 'to surround the pursuit of secular ends with a glow of religious emotion.' Anyone who has a first-hand acquaintance with English education knows that the leaders are deeply concerned to promote spiritual ends, but too often the preoccupation of the clergy with their own little dogmatisms prevents the Church from giving the help that would be gladly welcomed. Nor again is it true that persons who are loyal to the historical establishment, though they hardly ever enter a church or say a prayer,

> 'thrill with emotion at the thought that the Church is still called upon to add a little religious tinsel to occasions of national and civic solemnity.'

This sort of thing may be very clever, but Mr. Mascall might remember that we shall not convert the world by abusing it.

Mr. Mascall has all the pessimism which is fashionable among the young, and he can see little that is good in the world about him. But does he know it very well?

> 'The rich man needs the poor man to work for him, but apart from this the poor man is to him simply a potential revolutionary. The poor man needs the rich man to pay him, but apart from this the rich man is to him nothing but a tyrant grinding the faces of the poor.'

If Mr. Mascall has had parochial experience he must have been singularly unfortunate in his cure; or does he read too much of the party Press? He seems to have been equally unfortunate in his experience of the Church.

> 'Very many who profess and call themselves Christians are radically unconverted. They support the Church, often most energetically, because they wish to harness it to the pursuit of some purely secular and sublunar end, and because they realize, quite correctly, that it would serve their purpose better to exploit the Christian religion than to fight against it.'

Where are these dreadful people to be found? Your reviewer in the course of a fairly varied experience has never met one of them: he has known many who send a guinea or two to the parochial funds, though they seldom come to church, but he has never realized the sinister motives underlying their charity. Such people are generally puzzled seekers after truth who have not found that the Church meets their half-realized spiritual needs but who are not altogether unappreciative of its labours. If they are ever to be won it will be by an understanding sympathy, not by undiscriminating abuse.

Since Mr. Mascall fails to diagnose the cause of the world's sickness it is not surprising that he fails also to prescribe a cure. He believes in the saving power of Dogma. If he means that the world can find guidance only in obedience to the great truths enshrined in the teaching of Jesus and by

reliance on the power of His Spirit, he is unquestionably right; but it is clear from his book that by Dogma he means the theology of the Athanasian Creed and the philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas. The Angelic Doctor was a very great man, but he belonged to the thirteenth century, not to the twentieth, and a theologian less likely to help the modern world could hardly be found. He treats as axioms just those propositions concerning which the present generation is most sorely perplexed, and his *Summa* is built upon a conception of Revelation which the world can never again accept. Mr. Mascall hardly seems to realize this. As a teacher in a theological college he is presumably familiar with critical studies, but they seem to have made no impression on his mind, and he believes that for the world at large conviction is possible by a process of 'acceptance' without intellectual justification.

> 'What is necessary is not that we should *explain* the truth that God has revealed to us about Himself, but that we should gratefully accept it on His authority.'

From the context it appears that the reference is to the Athanasian Creed; but exactly when and how did God reveal it? The Creed did not drop down from heaven, it emerged after a long period of controversy, a period concerning which the Church has every reason to be ashamed.

There is much that is good in this book, but it reads like the work of a very young man. If Mr. Mascall can mellow a little, broaden his outlook and enrich his sympathies, he may give us something very much better. He may then drop his exasperating affectation of quoting the Bible in the Vulgate version and adding a translation in brackets. It is significant that most of his references are to Roman Catholic writers. P. GARDNER-SMITH.

AUGUSTUS CAESAR *

It is somewhat unfortunate that Dr. Allen's excellent little book about Augustus Caesar should have appeared about the same time as one with the same title by Lord Tweedsmuir. John Buchan, like Dr. Emil Ludwig, seems to have taken all biography for his province. But that is the worst of centenaries and bimillenaries, there is sure to be congestion.

Horace commiserates the fate of the heroes before Agamemnon who had no poet to keep their name in remembrance, who are forgotten, *carent quia vate sacro*. This was a delicate hint to Augustus who had such a superb pair of publicity agents as himself and Virgil to treat them with proper liberality. But it is a curious fact and a cheering one to those who dislike propaganda that all the flattery heaped upon Augustus by a chorus of poets has failed to render him really attractive. The cosmetics wear off, and the lineaments of the cold and crafty character reveal themselves. Besides, Augustus was a supremely successful man, and we most of us cherish in our heart of hearts a grudge against the successful. Shakespeare speaks for most of us in glorifying the failures, Brutus and Mark Antony, rather than young Caesar.

* *Augustus Caesar*. By Bernard M. Allen, M.A., LL.D. (Macmillan & Co. Ltd. 8/6.)

It is no disrespect, then, to Dr. Allen to say that he has not succeeded where Virgil and the rest of them failed. He has given an interesting and well-documented summary of all that is known of Augustus from his birth on September 23rd, B.C. 63, in the Consulship of Cicero and in the same year that Pompey entered the Holy of Holies at Jerusalem, till in A.D. 14 the dying Emperor rang down the curtain with the words,

> 'Since well we've played our part, your plaudits lend us
> And on our way, good friends, rejoicing send us.'

> 'As the words, "Caesar Augustus is dead," passed from Syrian coast to Syrian mountain, they were borne across the Galilean Hills and there must have reached the ears of a young Jewish lad, who was then living unknown in the town of Nazareth but who, within twenty years, would have founded a Kingdom which in its triumphant advance would sweep into itself the great Empire that Augustus had built and through succeeding centuries would go forth conquering and to conquer.'

To Him was to be transferred the sublime prophecy which Virgil meant for Augustus or for that son of his who never was born:

> *Jam nova progenies caelo dimittitur alto,* 'The kingdoms of this world are become the Kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ.'

Apart from bimillenaries and such artificial resuscitations Augustus has acquired a new interest for this generation as the prototype of the Dictators who are now coming to dominate Europe. Mussolini has taken advantage of this anniversary and hails the founder of the Roman Principate as his forerunner. Like Augustus, who professed to be the servant of the Senate and people, he is still in name a subject of the King of Italy. Other Dictators are less modest. The worship of the State so popular to-day seems to demand its personification in a man, a new Messiah. Will the twentieth century see a World State and with it a new Divus Augustus?

GAMALIEL MILNER.

THE REDEEMER *

In this volume Dr. Sparrow Simpson has added to the considerable recent output of theological literature in defence of what may be generally termed the *expiatory* theory of the Atonement. He himself defines the conception he maintains as lying

> 'in the fact that it is the one and only perfect Reparation offered to the Eternal Holiness; and that it was offered by the Son of God Who, for that very purpose, became the Son of man, in order that, being identified with humanity, and so their ideal representative, He might reconcile the sinful with the Sinless, and accomplish for His creatures what they never could accomplish for themselves.'

The author has been troubled by the fact that this doctrine does not hold the place in the preaching of the twentieth century that it held in a former age: and in these lectures, delivered to groups of laymen and clergy, he makes his contribution to the revival of interest and exposition he desires.

The book covers most of the well-trodden ground. Beginning with an exposition of the character of God as Holy, as Love, and as Father he goes on to discuss the Old Testament conception of Sacrifice, leading up to the culminating teaching of Isaiah 53. In the light of this teaching he interprets

* *The Redeemer.* By the Rev. W. J. Sparrow Simpson, D.D. (Longmans, Green & Co. 1937. 6/- net.)

the death of our Lord, proceeding thence to an examination of the thought of Paul and the Epistle to the Hebrews. The book closes with brief but pointed discussions of some historic interpretations, and a final exposition of 'The Eucharistic Sacrifice.' Both the exegesis and the discussions are in the line of traditional orthodoxy.

Certain religious conceptions underlie the whole treatment. The central issue resides in these latent presuppositions, and not just in the *minutiæ* of exegesis. To discuss such presuppositions is hardly the business of a reviewer. Yet it may be suggested that the real reason why preachers to-day have ceased to make central in their teaching the type of theory expounded in this volume are not differences from the author on points of biblical exegesis—many though these will be—or unfamiliarity with traditional interpretations. They lie deeper, in the fundamental conceptions of the nature of God and of sin. Dr. Sparrow Simpson's expositions are characterized by conservative care and traditionalist caution: but, lacking a sympathetic understanding of the inwardness of the modern preacher's silences and emphases, they will, it is to be feared, do little to achieve their end, except among those who share the presuppositions of the author.

C. J. WRIGHT.

TOWARDS UNDERSTANDING THE OLD TESTAMENT*

'The more books we can have like this,' says the Archbishop of York, 'the better it will be for everybody.' Dr. Allington does not write as a professional Old Testament scholar, but he has made his own the work of the specalist, and he now presents it in a manner which, as the Archbishop says, makes the book delightful reading. Doctors differ on many matters of Old Testament criticism, and no one will agree with every statement in the book; in particular the author attaches too much importance to the statements of the Chronicler concerning the return from the Exile, but taken as a whole this little book furnishes an interesting, reliable, and inspiring account of the ancient scriptures of the Jews. Our only quarrel is with the title, for the approach is hardly 'new.'

P. GARDNER-SMITH.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman*

SIR,

JAMES, SIMON AND JUDAS.

Your reviewer did me a service by drawing my attention to an oversight in my book, *The Christian Tradition*. The oversight is not fatal to the argument. It is a sufficiently remarkable coincidence that two Marys should both have sons named James and Joses. But that is not all. Josephus (*Antiq.* XX, v, 2) says that James and Simon, the sons of Judas the Galilean were crucified. Now three of the sons named in Mark vi, 3, are James, Simon and Judas. The very great improbability of the double coincidence points to the fact that the verse is an artificial construction.

L. G. RYLANDS.

62 Daisy Bank Road,
Manchester 14.
November 30th, 1937.

* *A New Approach to the Old Testament.* By C. A. Allington, D.D., Dean of Durham. With a Foreword by the Archbishop of York. (G. Bell & Son. 1937. 3/6.)

[Is not the very great improbability of the double coincidence enormously reduced by the fact that James, Simon and Judas were the commonest of Jewish names at this time?—Ed., *M.C.*]

WHAT IS RELIGIOUS BELIEF?

Sir,

Your correspondent, Mr. Hume-Rothery, would as I understand define belief as a judgment, on grounds of probability, 'as to what (hypothesis) should be our basis of action'; and would dissociate from it 'the idea of intellectually believing that basis to be absolutely true.'

I would suggest that it should be defined rather as a judgment as to the nature of reality; a judgment not indeed of absolute truth (which is not for finite minds) but of the truest to which we can attain; and one based, not simply or mainly on an intellectual balancing of probabilities (we cannot 'balance' a railway accident against the heroism it may occasion, or a sunset against serious illness)—but on insight and intuition. Without these latter capacities, we cannot rightly appreciate a work of art or even see a joke: how then without them can we hope to find religious truth?

As illustrating his very interesting point of view, your correspondent quotes a character in a book as saying, 'We do not know if (a loving) God exists, but live as he does.' Might not one reply, 'The fact that you presumably feel an *obligation* to live as if such a God exists is surely an indication for you as to the nature and source of this struggling and developing world, since you are a part of that world?'

Arthur Floyd.

Upavon, Pioneer Avenue,
Combe Down, Bath.
November 22nd, 1937.

NEEDFUL CHURCH REFORMS.

Sir,

As a member of the Modern Churchmen's Union may I suggest that it is not only in matters of doctrine that Church people require to cultivate a modern outlook.

In the National Health campaign the Church should take her share, and no longer supply free Prayer and hymn books (to its Sunday school children) of such microscopic print, that eyesight is bound to be strained, if not injured.

Another grave matter is the lack of social conscience in the passing of the Cup at the Holy Communion from mouth to mouth, sometimes hastily wiped now and then, but generally without any such inadequate precaution. And this at a time when every child for six days in the week is being warned not to share a cup, even at a picnic.

I do not desire the substitution of little glasses, with their distracting clatter, but why cannot the Holy Communion be administered at least once a month by intincture, a simple alternative, which I am told is the rule in West Africa. Those who liked the old way would still have their needs met, but I venture to think the clergy would be surprised by the increase in the number of their communicants at the alternative service.

F. E. Thornton.

The Heath,
Hindhead,
Surrey.